

THE
ANNUAL REGISTER:

A
REVIEW OF PUBLIC EVENTS AT HOME
AND ABROAD,

FOR THE YEAR

1871.

ENTERED
IN COMPUTER

NEW SERIES.



LONDON:

RIVINGTONS, WATERLOO PLACE.

LONGMANS & CO.; HAMILTON & CO; SIMPKIN & CO.;

HOULSTON & SONS, SMITH, ELDER, & CO., E. BUMPUS, J WALLER.

L. BOOTH, BELL & DALDY, H SOTHERAN & CO.,

BICKERS & SON, W. HEATH; J. TOOVEY, J WHELDON, R. WASHBOURNE,
AND RIVINGTONS, OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE.

1872.

CONTENTS.

PART I.

ENGLISH HISTORY.

CHAPTER I.

	PAGE
The War—Condition of England at the Opening of the Year—Agitation for Army Reform—The Black Sea Conference—Ireland—The Land Act—Ministerial Changes—Speeches on the Army Question before the Meeting of Parliament—Opening of Parliament—The Queen's Speech—Debates on the Address in both Houses—Army and Navy Estimates—The Army Regulation Bill—The Ballot Bill—The Trades' Union Bill—Princess Louise's Dowry	[1]

CHAPTER II.

Further Proceedings in Parliament—The Westmeath Committee—Debates on the Army Bill—The Licensing Bill—The Local Taxation Bill—The Budget—The Match Tax—Increased Income Tax—Admiralty Changes .	[38]
---	------

CHAPTER III.

The History of Purchase—Debates upon the Army Bill—The Duke of Richmond's Motion—Majority against the Government—Abolition of Purchase by Royal Warrant—Vote of Censure on the Ministry passed by the Lords—The Army Bill passed—The Ballot Bill thrown out by the Lords—University Tests Bill—Deceased Wife's Sister's Bill—Motion for the Disestablishment of the English Church—The Washington Treaty—The Berkshire Campaign and its Abandonment	[69]
---	------

CHAPTER IV.

The Situation in France—Democracy at Home—Royal Visit to Dublin—Mr. Gladstone on Home Rule—Mr. Gladstone at Greenwich—The "Seven Points" and New Social Alliance—Sir Charles Dilke—His Speech at Newcastle—The Dangerous Illness of the Prince of Wales—The Last Ministerial Difficulty—Appointment of Sir R. Collier to the Privy Council—Prevalence of Strikes	[101]
--	-------

CHAPTER V.

The Colonies—Fenians at the Red River Settlement—Australia—British India—The Wahabees—The Murder of Chief Justice Norman—Home Affairs—The School Boards and Education—The Money Market during the Year, &c—The Voysey and Purchas Judgments—The Tichborne Trial—Retirement of the Speaker—The Queen's Letter	[127]
--	-------

FOREIGN HISTORY.

CHAPTER I.—FRANCE.

PAGE

Military Situation at beginning of the year—Disturbances in Paris—Battles of Bapaume and St Quentin—Battle of Le Mans—Expedition of Bourbaki—Capitulation of Paris—Elections—Meeting of National Assembly—M. Thiers Head of the Executive—Acceptance of Preliminaries by the National Assembly—Entrance of German Troops into Paris . . . [118]

CHAPTER II.—FRANCE (*continued*).

Red Republican Party in Paris—Revolution of March 18—Assassination of Generals Le Comte and Thomas—Massacre of the Place Vendôme—Installation of the Paris Commune—Siege of Paris—Entrance of Versailles Troops—Conflagrations—Massacre of Hostages—Reprisals—End of the Commune . . . [175]

CHAPTER III.—FRANCE (*continued*).

Conclusion of Peace—Manifesto of the Comte de Chambord—French Finance—Army Reconstruction Bill—Thiers President of the Republic—Evacuation of Conquered Provinces—Execution of Rossel—Commercial Treaty with England reconsidered—Re-opening of the Assembly—Orleanist Princes take their Seats—Financial Statement . . . [202]

CHAPTER IV.—GERMANY, AUSTRO-HUNGARY.

Royal Proclamation, accepting the Imperial Crown—Return of the Conquerors—Elections to First Parliament of the German Empire—Bill for Incorporating Alsace-Lorraine—Interview of the Emperors of Germany and Austria—Reassembling of Parliament—Emperor's Speech—Budget—Cholera—Emperor William Austria—Count Beust and the two Parties of Centralization and Federalism—Hohenwart Ministry—Dissolution of the Reichsrath—Fall of Hohenwart—Kellersperg Ministry—Resignation of Count Beust—Kellersperg retires—Adolf Auersperg succeeds him—Emperor's Speech . . . [220]

CHAPTER V — ITALY — SPAIN — PORTUGAL — BELGIUM — NETHERLANDS — SWITZERLAND — SWEDEN — DENMARK — RUSSIA — TURKEY — GREECE.

The King's Arrival at Rome—Opening of Mont Cenis Railway Tunnel—First Italian Parliament at Rome—King's Speech. King Amadeus—State of Parties—Ruiz Zorrilla—New Elections—Change of Ministry—King's tour through the Provinces—Massacre at Havannah. Russia's Relations with Germany—Army Re-organization—Black Sea—Cholera—Pan-Slavism—New Black Sea Arrangements of Turkey—Death of the Grand Vizier—Roumanian Factions . . . [251]

CHAPTER VI — AMERICA.—UNITED STATES—BRAZIL—ARGENTINE REPUBLIC—ASIA.

St Domingo Annexation Project—Relations with Great Britain—Mr. Motley's Recall—Joint High Commission—Treaty of Washington—Orange Riot at New York—Erie Ring and Tammany Ring—Fire at Chicago—President's Message—Financial Report. Plague at Buenos Ayres. Famine in Persia [282]

RETROSPECT OF LITERATURE, ART, AND SCIENCE . . . [308]

PART II.

CHRONICLE OF REMARKABLE OCCURRENCES.

	PAGE
January	1
February	13
March	25
April	42
May	53
June	57
July	72
August	80
September	92
October	104
November	119
December	130

OBITUARY OF EMINENT PERSONS.

Dean Alford—Paul Bedford—Rev. Henry Caswall—Col. Sir Proby Thomas Cautley, K.C.B.—Sir William Denison—Sir Henry Durand—The Duchess de Frias—Sir George Hayter—Dr. Mayo—Alexander Munro—Lord Frederick Paulet—John Abel Smith—Sir William Verner, Bart.—M. A. Applegarth—General Robert Douglas, C.B.—Mrs Nathaniel Hawthorne—Canon Melvill—T. W. Robertson—Dr. Symonds—The Queen of Sweden—Robert and David Chambers—Professor De Morgan—Sir Charles Shaw—Sir Anthony Sterling—Mr. J. B. Chatterton—The Judge Advocate General—Captain Ogilvy—Omar Pasha—Schamyl—Sir Justin Sheil, K.C.B.—Auber—Major-General Douglas—Sir John Herschel—Mr. Secondary Potter—Marquis of Westmeath—Lieut.-General Williams—Hon. Frederick Byng—General Ellicombe—George Grote—Mr. N. E. Hartog—Lieut.-General Higgins—Lieut.-Colonel Milles—Mr. Pollard-Urquhart—Sir J. Rolt—Sir Joseph Rudsdell—Mr Vincent Scully—Dr. James Watson—Sir Thomas Acland—Dr. Keith Johnstone—Colonel Mann—Dean Mansell—Charles Buxton—Admiral Kingcomb—Richard Bentley—William Blenkiron—Sir T. Deane—Right Hon. George Hamilton—Canon Jelf—Dr. Mortimer—Mr. Chief Justice Norman—Bishop Patteson—Sir James Pennethorne—Cipriani Potter—Dr. Solly—Charles Babbage—Matthew Bell—Sir John Burgoyne—James Dark—Lord Dunraven—Sir Henry Harington—Sir Francis Moon—Sir Roderick Murchison—Dr. Seeman—Ichabod Wright—Dr. Rock—Mr. Tinney—Lord Chesterfield—Lord Ellenborough—Mr. Gaspey—Justice George—Mr. Greatehead—George Hudson—Lord Kenmare—Mr. Marriott—Sir Edward Morris—Admiral Ramsay—Mrs. Ryves—Sir James Scarlett—The Bishop of Victoria	140
--	-----

REMARKABLE TRIALS.

The Voysey Case	166
The Purchas Case	187
The Tichborne Case	210

	PAGE
The Boulton and Park Trial	220
The Diamond Robbery	221
The Trial of Edmund Pook	229
The Trial of Flora Davy	234
The Trial of Kelly	235
The "Agincourt" Court Martial	240
The "Meguera" Court Martial	243

APPENDIX.

PUBLIC DOCUMENTS AND STATE PAPERS.

The Belgian Treaty between England and Prussia	247
Diplomatic Correspondence upon the Franco-German War	248
Correspondence respecting the Sinking of Six British Vessels in the Seine by Prussian Troops	255
Correspondence between British Subjects residing in France and the Foreign Office, in reference to Loss of Property since the Entry of the German Troops into France	259
Correspondence respecting the Pecuniary Demands of Prussia on France	265
Diplomatic Papers relating to Luxemburg	268
Lord Lyons and the British Residents in Paris	270
The Black Sea Conference	272
France and the Conference	291
The Treaty of Washington*	294
The Abolition of Purchase	304

FINANCE ACCOUNTS—

Gross Receipts from Customs and Excise in the United Kingdom during the Financial Year ended 31st March, 1871	310
Gross Receipts from Stamps in the United Kingdom, &c.	311
Gross Receipts from Taxes in the United Kingdom, &c.	ib.
National Debt	312

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS	314
THE MINISTRY	316
SHERIFFS FOR 1871	317

ERRATA.

PART I.

- Page 88, line 26, *for* Bill *read* Act
— 129, — 33, *for* Gavan Duff *read* Gavan Duffy
— 133, — 4, *for* Bill *read* Act
— 351, — 36, *for* his merits *read* the merits of Mr. Joaquim Miller

PART II.

- 24, — 2, *for* accused of heresy *read* accused of illegal observances
— 81, — 10, *for* the first Bank holiday *read* the first summer Bank holiday
— 161, — 6, *for* represented Sunderland from 1845 to 1859 *read* 1845 to 1849

ANNUAL REGISTER,

FOR THE YEAR

1871.

PART I.

ENGLISH HISTORY.

CHAPTER I.

THE War—Condition of England at the opening of the Year—The Money Market—Unpopularity abroad—Alarmists at home—Attitude of the Ministry—Agitation for Army Reform—The Licensing Bill—Contagious Diseases Acts—The Affair at Duclair—The Black Sea Conference—History of the Russian Note—Ireland—Meath Election—The Land Act—Strength of the Ministry—Personal Unpopularity of Mr. Ayrton and others—Ministerial Changes—The Army Question before the Meeting of Parliament—Speech of Sir W. Mansfield—Letter of Earl Russell—Question of the Abolition of Purchase—The Small-Pox Epidemic—Opening of Parliament—The Queen's Speech—Debates on the Address in both Houses—Debates on Foreign Affairs—Speeches of Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Disraeli, and others—Army and Navy Estimates—The Army Regulation Bill introduced by Mr. Cardwell—Mr. Trevelyan's Motion—The Ballot Bill—The Trades' Union Bill—Indian Budget—Princess Louise's Dowry.

THE War, and nothing but the War, occupied the hearts and minds of men at the beginning of the year 1871. From day to day we looked with absorbing interest for the thrilling narratives which day after day brought to us from the seat of war,—the wonderful romances of the “besieged resident,” or “our own correspondents” at Versailles. Previous and contemporary transactions had been reduced, by the astonishing events of the second half of 1870, to real or apparent insignificance. Spectators of the great Continental drama had almost forgotten for the moment their own domestic affairs. At public meetings as in private society speakers, with the approval of the audience, habitually departed from the avowed purpose of the assemblage to the absorbing topic of the war, and publishers had almost suspended literary enterprise, because neither fiction nor former history was capable of competing with it. Though industrial and commercial activity, meanwhile, which had at last revived after a long depression extending over three or four years, was checked and disordered at first by the

sudden closing of Continental workshops and markets, the condition of England was on the whole fairly prosperous at the opening of the year. The public revenue maintained its customary elasticity. The money and discount markets were in a very easy condition. Money was in far greater supply than demand; and rates which shortly before were quoted for three months' bills at $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. owing to requirements connected with balancings and adjustments at the end of the year, had receded to $2\frac{1}{4}$ to $2\frac{3}{8}$ per cent., and this before the disbursement of the public dividends, which commenced at the close of the first week of the year. One main cause of the abundance of supplies was clearly to be traced to the Continental war. Before it broke out Paris was every year becoming more and more a financial centre, where foreign loans were negotiated sometimes on terms more favourable to the borrowers than could be obtained in England or Germany. In this way various countries were gradually coming under tribute to the capitalists of France, and the interest upon such debts punctually found its way to Paris. Egypt, Turkey, and Spain were the chief, but not the sole contributors. Whilst the gates of Paris remained closed, money could be sent neither to nor from the besieged capital; and thus the dividend distributions on foreign loans that used to be made in Paris were at this time being made in London, with the necessary effect of increasing our immediate supplies. It was anticipated, also, that some years might elapse before such business returned to Paris.

The loudly-expressed sympathy for France, which made itself heard in too many quarters, was neither very logical nor very wise, in the case at least of the large number of people who had professed themselves partisans of the German cause at the outbreak of the war, and seemed to have been converted either by an irrational sympathy with the name of a republic, or an even less rational feeling that France had suffered enough. With her usual felicity in these matters England had brought upon herself the enmity of both the belligerent parties, loudly proclaimed in the one case, and more quietly, and somewhat contemptuously, expressed in the other. But neither vituperation nor thanklessness, it must be said, availed for a moment to stay the stream of charity which the ever open hand of England poured out upon the sufferers by the war. Meanwhile she was in one of her fits of periodical alarm about herself, and to believe those who should know best, she was never in so fatally unprepared a condition as now, at a moment when the Prussian armaments were secretly gathering against her, if indeed the French war, as some of our journals more than insinuated, had not been undertaken chiefly as a prelude to the working-out of some sinister design upon ourselves. Loudly and publicly, after our usual fashion, did we proclaim every where and in every way, as the best means of averting the danger, our hopeless state of incapacity and misgovernment, and declare ourselves an easy prey to the coming invader; while almost in the same breath many of those who rated loudest were calling on

us to make common cause with the French Republic. Fortunately the Prussians either did not believe us, or spared to act on the belief. Perhaps—for the contemporary historian can only speak in perhapses—they had so much upon their hands that they did not think very much about us. Fortunately, too, Mr. Gladstone's ministry held firm, more happy in this than they were destined to prove themselves in the legislation of the forthcoming session, which was to bring to them little but failure and mortification. In her relations to the belligerent powers, as far as in them lay, they held England blameless, and the general voice of the country fully and unreservedly approved them. But that general voice, at the same time, called upon them to take rigorous measures for increasing the efficiency of our forces by a sweeping reform, which, all allowance made for panic and exaggeration, was universally felt to have become a pressing necessity. Orators "stumped" the country in all directions, preaching the need of vigorous action, foremost among whom, in mark and success, was Mr. George Trevelyan, the young member for the Border boroughs, who had made for himself a specialty of the "abolition of purchase," as the first great step required. So much had the ideas on this point, of which he stood forward as the exponent, penetrated the mind of the country, that it will be seen that this particular reform was adopted and incorporated by the ministry in the scheme proposed by them to Parliament, by a concession altogether unexpected, and further that, when the Army Regulation Bill finally became law by a violent exercise of power which will be described in its place, it had been narrowed to little more than a measure for the abolition of purchase. Army Reform was not the only subject of domestic oratory and agitation at the commencement of the year, as Mr. Bruce's threatened Licensing Bill came in for its full share; and if the interest taken in it was not so widely spread as the interest in the military question, it was certainly quite as genuine. The Licensed Victuallers marshalled a violent and, in the end, successful opposition to Mr. Bruce. The Contagious Diseases Acts furnished another subject of agitation, the opposition to them being led by certain women, who were not ashamed to use arguments in public which men on their side were too modest to answer. So effective was the turmoil they created, that candidates for Parliament were every where called upon to pledge themselves to the repeal of the obnoxious measures, by working-men to whom the scope and objects of them had been in many cases studiously misrepresented. Thus Sir Henry Storks, who manfully declared his intention to support the Acts, and whose presence in Parliament at this crisis was most desirable for other reasons, with great difficulty found a seat at Ripon. The days of a most useful sanitary reform appeared already numbered.

With these sore subjects added to the excitement created by meetings of sympathy with the French Republic, doomed in a very few weeks to alienate all but the most revolutionary of her admirers, it will be seen that there was enough food and to spare, at the com-

commencement of 1871, for the usual speech-making and letter-writing that usher in the meeting of Parliament. We had our foreign questions also. The public mind was excited at the commencement of the year, by the story of the Prussian seizure of our vessels at Duclair¹, and there were not wanting newspapers, as well as individuals, to do all in their power to magnify it into an immediate cause of quarrel, and to set it down to the deliberate and diabolical machinations of Prince Bismarck, (to anticipate his new honours by a few weeks). Unluckily, or luckily, for these alarmists, the German Chancellor proved himself at once perfectly reasonable upon the subject. In a message sent without delay to Lord Granville, he wrote, "You are authorized to say to Lord Granville that we sincerely regret that our troops, in order to avert immediate danger, were obliged to seize ships belonging to British subjects. We admit their claim to indemnification, and shall pay to the owners the value of the ships according to equitable estimation, without keeping them waiting for the decision of the question who is finally to indemnify them. Should it be proved that excesses have been committed which were not justified by the necessity of defence, we should regret it still more, and call the guilty persons to account." A rumour that the German demands on France would include the cession of Pondicherry, which excited English society for the moment more perhaps than any thing else during the war, was also contradicted as soon as spread. More important foreign questions we had at this time to deal with, in the shape of the neutralization of the Black Sea, and the famous Russian note upon that head which had caused so much excitement, and also in the well-worn Alabama claims, which had grown to be a weariness and vexation of spirit to public and politicians on both sides of the Atlantic, and would seem to survive in America only as a useful expedient to be employed when an Irish vote was to be bidden for. To settle the Black Sea question, a Conference met in London early in the year; to dispose of the Alabama claims, a treaty was subsequently agreed upon and drawn up at Washington, of which further mention will be made in its place. Both these negotiations resulted in a settlement which was greeted with general satisfaction, and must therefore be accepted by the annalist as satisfactory. But it must be open to him to wonder in what light such settlement would have appeared to our fathers, in days, when other, though it may be very mistaken, views were taken of national credit and national honour. There would seem to be some strange inconsistency in the disposition which willingly, and even gratefully, accepts such arrangements as these, and quarrels beforehand over such trifling and unavoidable incidents as the seizure at Duclair.

The Conference was invited with a view to deliberate on, and, if possible, to come to a friendly agreement in respect of, certain complaints made by Russia as to the bearing of the Treaty of 1856

¹ An Account of this occurrence will be found in our "Chronicle."

upon her national position. It will be remembered that, at the close of the Crimean War, which was certainly provoked by Russian ambition, that gigantic Northern Power was put under a restraint by the other great Powers of Europe, necessarily partaking of a penal character. Russia had broken the peace of Europe by crossing the Pruth, in the same violent fashion as Napoleon III. disturbed the public tranquillity of the European system by declaring war against Prussia. The Emperor Nicholas did so with a view to the aggrandisement of Russia at the expense of Turkey in Europe. A strong warlike fleet issued from the supposed impregnable port and arsenal of Sebastopol, and, taking the fleet of Turkey at a disadvantage, practically destroyed it. When the war arising out of these events was brought to an issue adverse to the designs of Russia, it was both natural and fitting that the Power which for a merely selfish end had defied the strength of the other Powers of Europe should be placed under conditions intended so far to restrict its natural rights as to prevent the possibility of a like irruption in future.

On the fall of Sebastopol, and the conclusion of a treaty with Sweden, by which the Allies would have been able to carry the war into Finland, Austria renewed the offer of her good offices, and four points for which the Allies were contending were again presented in a more detailed form. The third point—that “the Treaty of July 13, 1841 (known as the Treaty of the Straits), should be revised by the high contracting parties in the interest of the European balance of power, and with a view to a limitation of the Russian power in the Black Sea”—now took the shape of an agreement that the Black Sea should be neutralized, that its waters should be open to the merchant marine of all nations, but not to any ships of war; that there should be no military arsenals on its banks; and that Russia and Turkey should mutually engage to maintain in the Black Sea only a specified number of light vessels for the service of the coasts. Before this was submitted to Russia, it had been warmly discussed by the Western Powers. A proposal by France to lower the terms provoked an indignant remonstrance from England, Lord Palmerston declaring that, sooner than accept inadequate terms, England and Turkey would carry on the war alone. England insisted that the engagement as to the Black Sea must be embodied in the general treaty with the Powers, and must not be modified without their assent. These views carried the day, and on January 5, 1856, Count Nesselrode accepted the bases of the negotiation.

These preliminaries being settled, the Congress of Paris opened on February 25, and on March 4 the third point came up for consideration. It was agreed that the Black Sea should be neutralized, and that its waters and ports, while thrown open to the mercantile marine of every nation, should be “formally and *in perpetuity* interdicted to the flag of war, either of the Powers possessing its coasts or of any other Power, with the exceptions stipulated in the present Treaty.” The paragraph as to the prohibition of military

arsenals was also adopted. Lord Clarendon pointed out that the maintenance of an arsenal of the first class at Nicolaieff, though not on the shores of the Black Sea, would justify public opinion in "attributing to Russia intentions which she cannot entertain. Upon this the first plenipotentiary of Russia replied "that the Emperor, his august master, on acceding with sincerity to the propositions of peace, firmly resolved strictly to carry out all the engagements resulting from them; . . . that in order at once to provide for his engagements and for the requirements of the naval service, the Emperor intends only to authorize the construction at Nicolaieff of the vessels of war mentioned in the bases of the negotiation." Further, Count Orloff agreed to the insertion of his declaration in the Protocol, adding that, to prove his sincerity, the Emperor requested a free passage through the Bosphorus and Dardanelles for the two ships of the line which alone were then at Nicolaieff, and which would have to proceed to the Baltic as soon as peace was concluded.

Thus, the Black Sea, which washes the southern coasts of Russia, was neutralized, and no ships of war beyond the number of six, and these of a small size, were permitted to appear in the waters of the Euxine.

No doubt, this was a humiliation to Russia. All other Powers were free to have what navy they pleased within their own waters. For fourteen years Russia was made an exception, and, until recently, had quietly submitted to the restraint imposed upon her. She took advantage, however, of the supposed annihilation of the French power by the capitulation of Metz to announce her intention no longer to abide by the Treaty of 1856, so far as it related to the neutralization of the Black Sea, and henceforth to treat the provisions of it which had that end in view as of no force. Europe was struck with astonishment at the effrontery of this declaration. There was no indisposition any where to reconsider the stipulations of the treaty in the interest of Russia, nor to relieve her from the pressure of such of them as were penal in their nature, on the understanding that all the parties to the treaty should be properly invoked to give their consent to that release. But Earl Granville, on the part of this country, led the way in protesting against the assumed right of any one signatory to set aside at his own will an international agreement made between several Powers, and dealt with the announcement of Russia as of no effect.

In assuming a right to abolish her own treaty engagements, there can be no doubt that Russia counted upon some general understanding she had arrived at with Prussia, that the latter Power would assist her in effecting her wishes. She deprived herself, however, of the benefit which it might have given her, by her own impatient and premature action. Count Bismarck, no less than the leading statesmen of other European Powers, was taken by surprise. Prussia had enough upon her hands to task all her energies to the utmost, without precipitating another war, in which

she would have been held bound to take part. Count Bismarck, therefore, counselled Russia to be patient and moderate, and proposed the convening of a Conference as the likeliest means of achieving without offence, and with the full concurrence of all the signatory Powers, the object upon which she had set her heart. Finding herself alone as to the method she had adopted for gaining her ends, she listened to reason, and consented to ask as a boon what she had previously declared her intention of taking as a right. Invitations were thereupon issued by Earl Granville to the other signatory Powers, all of which consented to attend, on the full understanding that they should enter the Conference wholly unpledged.

Some delay arose in the assembling of the Conference in consequence of the anomalous position of France. The provisional nature of the existing Government had not, it is true, prevented France from being represented at this gathering of Plenipotentiaries, inasmuch as a formal invitation was sent to the Government of Defence, and accepted by that Government: but M. Jules Favre, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, whom his colleagues requested to appear for France on the occasion, felt himself unable to quit the side of General Trochu at the moment when Paris was undergoing actual bombardment. No one could blame him for the reluctance he expressed to quit the spot on which the primary duties and responsibilities of his office called for his continued presence. Hence the adjournment of the Conference, at first without any attempt to enter upon the business for which it was convened. The French Ministry at first demanded that the question of the war and the position of France should be brought before the Conference. To this Lord Granville was unable to assent. Dreading the delay, which, in the best of cases, must ensue in the despatch of a Plenipotentiary from France, he suggested the appointment of M. Tissot, the *Chargé d'Affaires* in London. All the other Powers had appointed as their Plenipotentiaries their representatives at the English Court. A most unpleasant delay, and the lamentable absence of a representative of France from a great European Council would have been spared had Lord Granville's advice been accepted. On the 18th of December, 1870, Lord Granville received a formal intimation that a French Plenipotentiary would present himself at the Conference. On the 23rd the official invitations were sent out from the Foreign Office, among others to M. Tissot as the substitute for the French Plenipotentiary. The day of meeting was fixed for the 3rd of January, 1871.

The French Plenipotentiary chosen was M. Jules Favre, and M. de Chaudordy, in announcing his name to the English Government, begged that it would obtain a pass out of Paris for M. Favre from the Prussian head-quarters, and that the Prussians should communicate for this purpose with the besieged city. Lord Granville replied that the Prussians had determined to send no more flags of truce, in consequence of some recent alleged acts of treachery on the

part of the French, and that the application for a safe conduct must come from M. Favre. A weary game of cross purposes followed. Count Bismarck was not very obliging, and M. Favre was irritated and wayward. It finally became clear that M. Favre did not mean to attend, and Lord Granville on the 6th of January recapitulated in a despatch to Lord Lyons the efforts he had made to secure the presence of a French representative at the Conference. As the best means of supplying this void Lord Granville affirmed that, whatever the decision of the Conference, it should be ultimately left open for the adhesion of France, and that before and after each sitting the course of business should be communicated to the French *Chargé d'Affaires*.

The Conference was postponed to the 17th of January, in the hope of obtaining the presence of M. Favre. Lord Granville was desirous to postpone the meeting longer, but the Austrian and Turkish Ministers deprecated delay. At the first sitting only the general question of international law was debated, and all the Powers represented signed a note expressly repudiating the right of any single Power to retreat from a Treaty without the previous consent of its co-signatories, or a majority of them. The discussion of the Treaty was adjourned to the 26th, by which time it was hoped M. Favre might arrive. But the emergency at Paris had now become so terrible that M. Favre no longer desired to leave the city, and the result was that the other European Powers were compelled to meet and discuss the Eastern Question without the assent or co-operation of France.

The correspondence which led to the Conference was laid before Parliament soon after its meeting. It was on the 9th of November that Baron Brunnow communicated to Lord Granville a Circular Note, sent at nearly the same time to the other Powers who signed and guaranteed the Treaty of Paris, and also a despatch addressing its arguments more particularly to the English Government. The purpose of the Note was to declare that the Czar felt himself no longer bound by the provisions of the Treaty of Paris signed by himself and the Sultan, and that he withdrew from the joint Convention appended to the Treaty, which prescribes the size and number of war vessels to be maintained by the two Powers within the Straits. It is worth while to cite Article XIV. of the Treaty itself:—

“Their Majesties the Emperor of all the Russias and the Sultan having concluded a Convention for the purpose of settling the force and the number of light vessels necessary for the service of their coasts which they reserve to themselves to maintain in the Black Sea, that Convention is annexed to the present Treaty, and shall have the same force and validity as if it formed an integral part thereof. *It cannot be either annulled or modified without the assent of the Powers signing the present Treaty.*”

Prince Gortschakoff's Circular, dated “Tsarskoé-Sélo, October 19-31, 1870,” distinctly intimated the intention of the Czar to violate the last-cited clause. It began by insisting that recent

changes in the settlement on which the European balance of power rested had compelled Russia to review her political position. The part of that settlement which most directly affected her was the Treaty of 1856; a Convention appended to it limited the naval power of Russia in the Black Sea, and the Treaty, in return, neutralized that Sea. But while the former portion of the arrangement effectually weakened Russia, the latter was plainly powerless to protect her. Turkey was not restricted in her navy in the Archipelago or the Straits, nor England and France in the Mediterranean. As the Straits were only closed, by Treaty, in time of peace, Russia was always exposed on a declaration of war to be attacked on her coast-line even by a weaker State at a disadvantage—a disadvantage rendered the more oppressive by the introduction of ironclad vessels of war since 1856, and the consequent increased difficulty of improvising defence. Urging so far the unequal operation of the neutralization policy, Prince Gortschakoff went on farther to point out that the Treaty of 1856 had been violated in important particulars. Moldavia and Wallachia, the position of which had been fixed and guaranteed by the Treaty, had been permitted to pass through revolution into union, and to elect a foreign prince. "The representative of Russia," added the Prince, "was the only one who raised his voice to remind the Cabinets that by this tolerance they would be departing from the distinct stipulations of the Treaty." Furthermore, on several occasions the neutrality of the Black Sea had been violated under various pretexts by the admission of war-vessels and even "whole squadrons," within the Straits. The Czar, in view of these facts, "could not admit, *de jure*, that Treaties violated in several of their essential and general clauses should remain binding in other clauses" directly affecting the "interests of his empire," nor could he "admit, *de facto*, that the security of Russia should depend on a fiction which has not stood the test of time." His Imperial Majesty therefore declined to recognize any longer the neutralization of the Black Sea, and withdrew from the Naval Convention, restoring, at the same time, to the Sultan the full exercise of his rights, and "loyally informing" the other Powers of his action. He added an assurance that "he" had no wish to revive the Eastern Question, that he adhered to the principles of the Treaty of 1856 as fixing the position of Turkey, and was ready to enter into any understanding to this effect with the other Powers.

A despatch designed to justify the Circular to the English Government was handed at the same time to Lord Granville by Baron Brunnow. It referred to the negotiations for a Conference in 1866, when it was urged on the part of Russia that the occurrence of certain eventualities modifying the *status quo* in the East must lead to a revision of the Treaty. Lord Russell at the time admitted that any such change in the situation must be followed by a change in the obligations imposed on the Powers. These eventualities had not occurred; but it will not be disputed, the Prince affirmed, that

the manner in which Roumania has become independent has been an infringement of the Treaty, which casts doubt on its binding force. The Emperor's decision implied no change in his Eastern policy, or in his perfect accord with England,—“the best guarantee for the preservation of peace and the balance of power in Europe.”

On the same day that these despatches were received by him, Lord Granville hastened to inform Sir A. Buchanan, our Ambassador at St. Petersburg, of the fact, adding that, considering the importance and suddenness of the communication, he had declined to make any reply without consulting his colleagues. The Government were determined, he said, “to measure their words on all questions involving international difficulties, so that there might not be the slightest chance of their going beyond that to which they intended strictly to adhere.” On the following day the Foreign Secretary was able to make a longer and more weighty communication. Recapitulating Prince Gortschakoff's complaints and final declaration, Lord Granville said :—

“An allegation is made that certain facts have occurred which, in the judgment of Russia, are at variance with certain stipulations of the Treaty, and the assumption is made that Russia—upon the strength of her own judgment as to the character of those facts—is entitled to release herself from certain other stipulations of that instrument.”

If a Power bound by Treaty can renounce a part of its obligations, he argued, it may renounce the whole. In the present case the question was not whether the claims of Russia to be released are reasonable, but whether one party to a Treaty may, of its own accord and without discussion, announce its immunity from some or all of its provisions. The right of releasing any party has ever been held to belong, not to one, but to all the parties; and Prince Gortschakoff's doctrine would lead to “the entire destruction of Treaties in their essence.” Treaties are agreements made binding by a partial surrender of the free will of each party, but if each may at pleasure bring back the subject into his own control, the surrender and binding force of the arrangement clearly becomes illusory. The expressed intention of Russia to abide by the rest of the Treaty was, in this point of view, as objectionable as her renunciation of the obnoxious clauses for it was merely an intimation of her individual free will, which she may at any time alter. The Powers, then, had nothing to do with the desire of Russia to be released from her former engagements; they had to consider “whether they are to accept from her the announcement that, by her own act, without any consent from them she has released herself from a solemn covenant.” Lord Granville expressed “deep regret” at the opening of a discussion which “might unsettle the cordial understanding” between England and Russia, but he firmly refused “to give any sanction to the course announced by Prince Gortschakoff.” If Russia had made complaint of the alleged infractions of the Treaty, or had protested against the severity of its pressure in altered circumstances, the

British Government "would not have refused to examine the question in concert with the co-signatories to the Treaty." Thus, "a risk of future complications and a very dangerous precedent as to the validity of international obligations would have been avoided."

It will be perceived that Lord Granville, taking his stand upon the faith of treaties, declined to enter into any argument respecting the grounds of complaint advanced by Russia. A tabular statement, however, of the instances in which foreign ships of war had been allowed to pass the Straits, and of other cases in which a question had arisen as to the passage of such ships, was published next to Lord Granville's despatch. Count Beust subsequently alluded to these cases as insignificant, and, in fact, we find that there were only ten altogether, and seven in which, though the passage of war-ships was contemplated, no violation of the treaty had been shown. Of the ten actual infractions three were by American vessels, two of which came on complimentary visits to the Sultan; two were Austrian ships, the firman for one having been granted in courtesy to Prince Adalbert of Bavaria, and the other admitted with her by mistake as intended for the service of the mission; one was a Prussian vessel, which was mistaken for the King's yacht, and entered the Straits on this misunderstanding; one was a French vessel conveying the Persian Ambassador back to his country; one was her Majesty's ship "Gannet," carrying Sir H. Bulwer on a visit to Kustendji, against the admission of which a Russian protest was made; and the remaining one was the Russian ship of war "Alexander Newsky," in which the Grand Duke Alexis embarked for his cruise in the Mediterranean without remonstrance. Two small Austrian vessels and a transport also passed through the Straits in 1869 to escort the Emperor from Varna to Constantinople, and the Russian remonstrance against their passage was withdrawn on the discovery that they were armed with only two guns apiece.

The second subject of Russian complaint, likewise passed over in silence by Lord Granville, was the union and independence of Roumania, which was protested against, Prince Gortschakoff alleged, by the Russian representative at the time. M. Visconti Venosta, in a despatch of later date than Lord Granville's, recalled to the memory of the Russian Chancellor these remarkable words, contained in a letter from Prince Gortschakoff to General Ignatieff, recognizing the election of Prince Charles of Hohenzollern as Hospodar of Roumania:—

"The Imperial Cabinet can only applaud a result as fully in harmony with the traditional sympathy which binds Russia to these people—her co-religionists—as with her desire to see the Ottoman Empire consolidated by the satisfaction of the legitimate wishes and wants of the Christian races which inhabit it."

The Italian Minister pointed to the difficulty of reconciling this language of congratulation with the alleged protest.

Lord Granville's first care was to send to Sir H. Elliot, at Constantinople, copies of the Russian despatches and of his own reply, and to reassure the Porte by pointing out the determination of England not to admit the assumption of Russia that she was privileged to break the Treaty of her own free will. To Lord Lyoⁿ at Tours a similar communication was made; but in the case of Prussia, Count Bismarck's unavoidable absence from Berlin during the siege of Paris rendered it necessary to send Mr. Odo Russell as a special envoy to Versailles with the Russian and English despatches. This was the more needful, as a general doubt existed respecting the relations of Prussia and Russia in regard to Eastern policy. On the 12th of November Lord Granville addressed Count Bernstorff on this subject, asking whether there was any reason to suppose that an engagement of mutual support existed in the matter between the two Northern Powers, and adding that, unless there was such an engagement, the declaration was as little courteous to Prussia as to any other of the Powers. Count Bernstorff professed his ignorance and his surprise at the form of the Circular; he stated that Mr. Odo Russell would be welcome at Versailles.

In default of instructions from his Court, Baron Brunow decided on maintaining a reserve, and declining to reply to Lord Granville's arguments. The Austrian Ambassador was the first to bring the news that his Government had adhered to the course taken by England. Count Beust, in answer to the Circular, confessed that he had expected some proposal for the revision of the Treaty of 1856, but that "the one-sided and sudden solution announced by Russia was a melancholy surprise, provoking irritation, establishing a dangerous precedent, and disturbing the East." Austria would treat the question "without passion and without *entraînement*," but would reserve full liberty of action. In the meantime, Lord Granville had been recommending the Turkish Ambassador that no precipitate action should be taken by Turkey, and had advised the Porte to communicate freely with the other Powers, and to reply to the Circular in terms similar to those used in the English despatch.

The Provisional Government at Tours, represented in the Foreign Department by M. de Chaudordy, were late in receiving official news of the step announced by Russia. The Italian Government hesitated, though pressed by the Cabinet of Vienna to make an early declaration of its policy, and desired to learn, first, the reception of the Circular in Turkey, and, next, the sentiments of England. M. Visconti Venosta, however, expressed to the Russian Minister the pain and surprise that the Circular had produced in him; he added that Italy was willing to co-operate with the co-signatories of the Treaty in revising any provisions that might seem unjust towards Russia, always saving the integrity and safety of Turkey. Sir A. Paget, who communicated this to Lord Granville, "was enabled to state" that the Italian Govern-

ment was desirous to act in unison with the English and Austrian Cabinets.

Sir A. Buchanan on the 16th of November presented Prince Gortschakoff with Lord Granville's reply of the 10th. The Prince said he would answer the English arguments calmly, and repudiated any but the most amicable intentions towards the Porte. He then returned to the discussion of his objections to the Treaty as set forth in the Circular, but Sir A. Buchanan pointed out the irrelevancy of this debate. Lord Granville had not entered into these objections, but had demurred *in limine* to the form of the Russian "renunciation," resting, as it did, on the assumption that any one Power signing a treaty might at any time terminate its obligations without consulting the co-signatories. The Prince declined to discuss this point, saying that "the Emperor's decision was irrevocable," and that Turkey, by assenting, would secure Russian goodwill; otherwise the consequence would be dangerous; for, though the policy of Russia was "entirely pacific," the Christian populations of Turkey would rise in arms at the first misunderstanding between the Governments. The Chancellor finally expressed surprise at the respect for the sanctity of treaties professed by the English Government, which had acquiesced in the extinction of the Germanic Confederation and the Kingdom of Hanover in 1866.

On the same day that Prince Gortschakoff was criticizing Lord Granville's answer to the Circular Count Beust was despatching his reply from Vienna. After quoting Article XIV. of the Treaty (already cited) he said,—

"We could not conceive nor admit a doubt as to the absolute force of this reciprocal engagement, even should one or other of the contracting parties think itself in a position to advance the most substantial considerations against the maintenance of any of the stipulations of a Treaty of which it had been agreed to declare beforehand that it could never be either annulled or modified without the assent of all the Powers that signed it."

Unlike the British Minister, the Austrian Chancellor proceeded to notice the Russian arguments for modifying the Treaty. The inequality complained of in the original arrangement might have prevented Russia from signing the Treaty or give ground for its revision after discussion now, "but it can never authorize an arbitrary solution." No more could the alleged infractions of the Treaty. It was Turkey, not Russia, that had reason to complain of the change introduced by Roumanian independence. As for the passage of war-ships through the Straits, "their appearances were certainly of a most inoffensive character," and in any case Russia might have met them with a protest. In conclusion Count Beust expressed the "painful regret," the "profound surprise," with which his Government had learnt the determination of the Czar, and called the "serious attention" of Russia to the consequences. In answer to a more private despatch addressed to Austria by the Russian Chancellor, which reminded the Austrian Government that it had itself

suggested in January, 1867, the release of Russia from the obnoxious restrictions in the Black Sea, Count Beust not only referred to the cool reception which was given at St. Petersburg to this conciliatory offer, but pointed out that Austria desired to act then conjointly with the other Powers as well as with Russia, and to proceed precisely in accordance with Article XIV. of the Treaty.

On the Austrian answer to the Circular, Lord Granville wrote to Lord Bloomfield that it appeared truthful and satisfactory, but he noticed two points of difference—Count Beust's reference in detail to the Russian claims, on which the English reply had not entered, and the less distinctly expressed refusal of Austria to sanction the Russian proceeding.

The action of Prussia, France, and Turkey now became matters of interest. A somewhat discouraging telegram from Mr. Odo Russell produced the impression that Count Bismarck was in favour of a revision of the Treaty in the sense of the Russian demands, and suggested a Conference at St. Petersburg. Count Bernstorff, in conversation with Lord Granville, laboured to remove the disappointment, and said that a St. Petersburg Conference was a Russian, not a Prussian suggestion. Lord Granville replied that he could not promise adhesion to a Conference; but if, on consideration, such a method of settlement seemed desirable, it could only be effected with the assent of all the Powers; it could not be held in the Russian capital, and it could not be agreed to subject to any foregone conclusion.

The way to this agreement was not smoothed by the receipt of Prince Gortschakoff's rejoinder to the English reply. The Prince declined to discuss the "strict law" of treaties urged by Lord Granville, or to cite any precedent. The form, he said, of the Russian declaration was not chosen by the Czar; "we should have asked for nothing better than to obtain our purpose by an understanding with the signatories of the Treaty of 1856." But proposed Conferences for the settlement of European disputes had repeatedly failed, and the state of France increased the difficulty. The Prince repeated his assurance that in abrogating one part of the Treaty Russia never intended to annul the whole, and pointed out that there was nothing to prevent England from entering into explanations on the subject with the other Powers.

This tone did not seem to favour a Conference on the basis which alone Lord Granville instructed Mr. Odo Russell to assure Count Bismarck would be accepted by England—viz., "an express understanding that it should be in no way prejudiced by any previous assumption as to the result of its deliberations." The objection to St. Petersburg as the place of meeting applied equally to Constantinople, and during the war Berlin could not be thought of. Lord Granville suggested London, Vienna, Florence, the Hague, Brussels, or Berne, as suitable places for the assembly. Count Bismarck, without much hesitation, agreed to the English basis of action, and

agreed upon London as the best place of meeting. It remained now to obtain the assent of the other Powers, but some little difficulties here became apparent. Communications were sent from Versailles to St. Petersburg and Florence, and from London to the Porte, Vienna, and Tours.

Lord Granville was able to give an easy reply to Prince Gortschakoff's allegation that the Czar's action was inevitable because suggested Conferences had constantly failed. He obtained from Baron Brunnow an admission that for twelve years past no demand had ever been presented on the part of Russia for a revision of the Treaty of 1856. In writing to Sir A. Buchanan he cited this point, with the keen deduction, "I cannot therefore admit that the imperial Government can justify this proceeding by the failure of efforts which have never been made." He dwelt hopefully in the same paper on Prince Gortschakoff's definition of the Russian declaration as "the abrogation of a theoretical principle without immediate application." If this meant that Russia has only expressed her own opinion, and will not act upon it without the assent of the other Powers, "it goes far to close the controversy." Finally he alluded to the Conference proposed by Prussia, and reiterated the resolution of England not to enter it should there be any foregone conclusion.

The Porte, however, desired "a foregone conclusion," and pressed on Sir H. Elliot that it was important the work of the assembled Plenipotentiaries should be restricted to the Black Sea question. Lord Granville was compelled to refuse this restriction as inconsistent with the more important reservation which he had insisted upon with Count Bismarck and the Russian Chancellor. The position of Italy, which was for a moment doubtful, was defined satisfactorily by M. Visconti Venosta's despatch of the 24th of November which, though studiously moderate in tone, firmly declined to assent to the Russian declaration.

On the 27th of November Count Bernstorff made a formal proposal for a Conference in London to Lord Granville. The Porte still resisted the plan unless confined to the Black Sea question, but Lord Granville endeavoured to reassure Musurus Pasha by the declaration that the Government thought it decidedly expedient to maintain the suggested restriction, but could not adopt it as "a foregone conclusion." At Constantinople, General Ignatieff was doing his best to restore confidence to the Turks, protesting, as Sir H. Elliot wrote, that the Czar had no instant intention of acting upon the rights he claimed, of constructing a Black Sea Fleet, or of impeaching any other article of the Treaty of 1856. Sir H. Elliot also commented upon the Russian statement that it was not Russian arms but the anger of the Christian populations that was feared, and affirmed that the threatened "withdrawal of Russian influence" so far from injuring the Porte would increase tranquillity, the subject races being not dangerous except when excited by foreign propaganda. With regard to the union of the Roumanian provinces,

he pointed out that it was effected contrary to the strong remonstrances of the Turkish Government, and that Count Kisseleff, Russian Plenipotentiary in the Paris Conference of 1858, strongly supported the "rational and legitimate desire" of the Principalities to be united under a foreign prince. In substitution for the neutralization of the Black Sea, Sir H. Elliot did not believe that the entire opening of the Straits to all nations would be acceptable to the Porte. A means of defence for Turkey against a Russian Black Sea fleet might be provided by giving the Sultan power, "in case of emergency," to call up the foreign fleets into the Straits.

The acceptance, on the 1st of December, of the Prussian proposal for a Conference was again accompanied with the protest against a foregone conclusion. The Government at Tours, considering the Prussian origin of the plan, could not assent without communicating with Paris, and the Porte still insisting on the restriction of debate held off. The indisposition of the French caused considerable delay. The Russian Government expressed a desire to consider the entire Treaty; Austria wished to settle limits and objects; Italy accepted the English basis. Count Beust contributed to complicate matters further by suggesting a preliminary meeting at Constantinople between the representatives of England, Austria, Italy, and Turkey, but from this Lord Granville dissented.

The Turkish Government, seeing that the modification or repeal of the neutralization clauses was recognized as inevitable, rapidly cooled in their idea of resisting Russia in the Black Sea by force; they resolved to limit their resistance to a solemn protest. Sir H. Elliot reported that General Ignatieff had shown him papers which proved that within three years from the date of the Treaty, the whole of the "parties to it," with the single exception of England, had shown Russia a readiness to sacrifice the principal element in it. General Ignatieff furthermore observed that he had heard Lord Palmerston say that the Treaty was so hard on Russia that it could hardly last ten years, and that some similar but "more cautious" observations had fallen from Lord Russell. Taking into account this evidence of general hostility to the clause in question, the Turkish Government had felt that further resistance to the change was hopeless.

The Russian Chancellor, on the 3rd of December, having not only withdrawn his claim to the maintenance of "a foregone conclusion" as the basis of a Conference, but having admitted that the Conference might record any opinion on the question of principle raised in Lord Granville's first despatch, the main difficulty was removed. General Ignatieff, however, seemed to have been ill-informed as to the views of his Government, for he insisted to Sir H. Elliot that the annulment of the neutralization clause was the basis of the negotiation, and that Russia considered those clauses annulled in practice from the time that her Majesty's ship "Gannet" had entered the Black Sea six years ago.

The other Powers now quickly gave in their formal adhesion, and

the Conference led to the results which from the first were generally anticipated. The neutralization of the Black Sea was abrogated, and the Porte permitted to open the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus to the vessels of war of friendly and allied Powers, in case the Government of the Sultan should think it necessary to do so in order to ensure the execution of the Treaty of 1856. At the same time the European Commission of the Danube was prolonged for twelve years, and the works already made or to be made on that river neutralized, with, however, the reservation to the Porte of its right to send ships of war into the river.

The first event of the year in Ireland was of a significant and not an encouraging nature. Meath, the premier county of Ireland, elected for its representative—in preference to Mr. Plunkett, a Catholic aristocrat of unblemished character, backed by Cardinal Cullen and the priests, and supported, too, by the Castle—one Martin, an Ulster Presbyterian, sometime editor of the *Irish Felon*, and transported for ten years for treason-felony in 1848. As a Nationalist, he was in every way estimable, well read, well educated, well travelled, and of good though not great abilities. But his success against a Liberal Catholic of rank was a formidable sign of the times. Martin had large majorities in Trim, Navan, and Kells, a small majority in Duleek, and a minority in Oldcastle and Dunshaughlin. There was no disturbance, but early on the polling-day a large number of Martinites entered Navan, carrying green flags and evergreens. Large forces of police and military were busily employed all day in keeping order, an additional troop of Dragoons having been telegraphed for and obtained from Dundalk. By noon the voting went on slowly until half-past twelve, when hundreds of voters began to come in from the country on cars to vote for Martin, for whom there was great enthusiasm. When the declaration of the poll was made, the number of votes for Martin were declared to be 1140; for Mr. Plunkett, 684.

Wanton murders were still unhappily rife in Ireland, and the barbarous and lawless spirit of the country showed little sign of being laid. Even the influence of the Peace Preservation Act was insufficient for its purpose, and the proposal for a secret committee to inquire into the condition of Westmeath, the “head-centre” of Irish savagery, made soon after the meeting of Parliament, was a painful acknowledgment how utterly conciliation had failed. It was but a small set-off to find the new Irish Land Act seeming to work on the whole satisfactorily, except perhaps as to costs.

Whatever our dangers and difficulties, however, at the commencement of the year the ministerial majority seemed as firm and unbroken as ever; though no small degree of personal unpopularity attached to some members of the Cabinet, destined to be indefinitely increased by the events of the Session. Mr. Ayrton’s administration of the Board of Works had secured him so undisputed a pre-eminence in this respect, that his constituents went so far as to pass a resolution at a large meeting, to the effect that “his rude, coarse

demeanour, both in and out of Parliament, had made the borough of the Tower Hamlets a byword throughout the United Kingdom." Mr. Lowe and Mr. Bruce were not in very high favour, and Mr. Gladstone himself was "invited to retire" by a considerable body of the electors of Greenwich. But the liberal majority in the House stood fast and firm. Some small ministerial changes inaugurated the year, Mr. Chichester Fortescue accepting the office of President of the Board of Trade, vacant by the enforced and regretted retirement of Mr. Bright; while the Marquis of Hartington, Postmaster-General, succeeded Mr. Fortescue as secretary for Ireland. Mr. Monsell, M.P. for Limerick, accepted Lord Hartington's former office without a seat in the Cabinet. A mysterious shuffle ensued in the smaller appointments. Mr. Knatchbull Hugessen replaced Mr. Monsell at the Colonial Office, Mr. Shaw Lefevre succeeded Mr. Hugessen at the Home Office, Mr. Arthur Peel replaced Mr. Lefevre at the Board of Trade, and Mr. Hibbert replaced Mr. Peel at the Poor Law Board. A more important change was the retirement of Mr. Childers from the Admiralty, which, though it did not actually take place till a later period, had been by this time, unfortunately, practically completed by the state of his health.

Among the numerous speeches on the reorganization of our army which marked the season before the opening of Parliament, prominence must be given to one delivered by Sir William Mansfield (raised during the Session to the Peerage, under the title of Lord Sandhurst) at Westminster Hall. "It is some years now," he said, "since I ventured to call the attention of persons in authority to our military system. At that time there was not much to cause anxiety, either in our relation with foreign Powers, or in our domestic condition; still what I then observed as to what is called the military organization of the country filled me with a sentiment not very far removed from alarm. I saw, and called the attention of others to the fact, that there were in this country numerous bodies of a military character, but that they all seemed pulling different ways, instead of co-operating in one grand harmonious whole for the good of the nation. The militia had one set of interests and the Volunteers another set of interests, while what is called the line, or the regular army, had also interests of its own, differing in degree, or in kind, from those of the other forces. All these bodies, I observed, sprang from what is called the Voluntary principle; that is to say, there was no fixed point of departure excepting the personal option of the individual man forming a constituent member of one or other of these bodies; and accordingly, when any thing had to be done, these various bodies were dragged aside by conflicting interests, just as you will always see that half a dozen men in a room will have each his own way of looking at the same subject. But that which is true of individual men, applies with ten times greater force when you are dealing with large bodies. When the option which is exercised by individual members of a body comes to be

multiplied by the number of members of which that body consists, you have at once a great vital force affecting the destinies of the country, and capable of producing the most important or the most fatal result, according to the direction which may be given to it. Let me ask, then, when you have in existence bodies of armed men, paid by the country, and organized with a view of defence, some of them intended for service abroad, some for special duties in this country, others again, like yourselves, to be called upon as a last resource in case it should please God to permit this country ever to be exposed to a state of things entailing that necessity, can there be any thing more fatal, any thing more erroneous—whether we regard the matter as one of national moment, or as one of expediency, or as one merely affecting the Parliamentary estimate—than a state of things in which this division and contrariety between the several bodies together, constituting what is called our military organization, is suffered to exist and continue? (Applause.) Lord Elcho has told us that the session of Parliament which is about to commence must not close without the great question of army organization being settled in a matter satisfactory to the country. I am not a political man, and I will not venture to say whether such a result will follow from the labours of the present session; but this I do say, that it is the duty, not only of those who are in office, but also of those who are out of office, to see that the session does not terminate without this great subject being weighed, and such practical results, at least, attained as shall cause the division to which I have alluded to cease, and be known henceforth only as a matter of history. I have said that, according to my apprehension of the subject, the vital difficulty with which we have to deal is the conflict of interests between the different bodies which make up the military organization of England. What is it that causes that conflict of interests? It arises from the fact that every one of these bodies relies for its existence merely upon the voluntary principle. As regards bodies such as that which I am now addressing, consisting of men who stand forward as volunteers willing to give up to the State such time as they can spare from the avocations pressing upon them, it would be absurd to expect that any principle of organization other than the voluntary principle could apply to them. Then, as regards what is known as the line. From whatever point of view we in England may contemplate what is going on upon the Continent, however we may be moved by the spectacle of two great military nations struggling, and with whatever feelings we may see these countries placing their whole population under arms, not merely embodying them for purposes of defence, but sending them across the frontiers as well, I do not believe there is any one who would like to see such an organization adopted and applied to this country. The regular army is called on to serve in all parts of the world, and frequently in tropical climates. I consider it, therefore, to be absolutely necessary that the line should continue to be raised as heretofore upon the voluntary principle. But

there is a third body, as to which the circumstances are different, and this is the body that competes with the line for recruits as matters at present stand. The conflicting interests to which I have alluded as existing between the militia and the line can alone, in my opinion, be reconciled by causing the militia to be raised on that ancient principle of obligation which always belonged to the constitution of this country, which has always been recognized as the first duty of every member of the population, but which recently, for a certain number of years, has been held in suspension. I believe it to be absolutely necessary that we should revert to that principle of obligation—that is to say, that every man, without respect to his rank or to his position in the world, shall be liable to serve, in his own person, in the ranks of the militia. (Applause.) There may be certain exemptions which it would be necessary to make, particular persons that ought not to be thus employed; but a primary obligation should rest upon every man to serve in person, and no pecuniary sum of any amount should enable a man, whatever his rank or whatever his position, to save his person by means of his purse. (Applause.) I have sometimes heard it said that to revert to this ancient principle of obligation as a means of filling our army of home defence would be to interfere with the liberty of the subject. Let that proposition be fairly examined. I should like to meet a man who would stand before me and say he declined to come forward in defence of his country, because to do so would interfere with his liberty as an Englishman. People who use such an argument, and who contend that you should rely entirely upon voluntary service for the purposes of home defence—that is to say, that you should cause men to enter the militia solely for the sake of the moderate pay or the petty bounties that are offered to them—forget that this is a measure which secures what are called the comfortable classes at the expense of those who are not so well off. (Loud applause.) Addressing as I do a body of volunteers who may be taken as representatives of that great body of 150,000 men now in arms, I think I may fairly say that however much they belong to the comfortable classes, they, at least, have not shirked the duty which is incumbent upon every Englishman, but have stood forth when wanted for the defence of the country, at considerable loss of time and comfort, and without pay, or any thing being done for them except some help which may occasionally have been given by their commanding officers. I say, then, do not let us be led away by any argument about interference with the liberty of the subject. What is required from us, and what is rightly required from every subject, is that he should stand forward for the defence of the country—not according to his individual option, but according to his individual liability—whenever he is called upon by the nation to do so. And to do this involves no forfeiture, but on the contrary, an assertion, of the liberty of the subject.”

Prominent among those who came forward with their views upon this absorbing subject was Earl Russell, who in a letter addressed

to the *Times* laid down the following as the objects to be secured in any re-organization of our national defences:—

“The United Kingdom ought to be defended against invasion. The colonies and dependencies of the United Kingdom ought to be protected by our naval and military forces against a foreign enemy. The engagements of the Crown and of our country with foreign Powers ought to be fulfilled. Let us add to these three objects, that when our honour or our interests are deeply involved in some national dispute they ought to be firmly maintained.”

In order to secure these objects, Lord Russell, borrowing from Sir John Burgoyne, Sir William Mansfield, and other distinguished officers, and adding some proposals drawn from his own civil experience, made the suggestions which follow:—

“1. That not less than 200,000 men, consisting of regular army and embodied militia, should be kept up within the United Kingdom.

“2. Army.—That the system of purchase of commissions in the army should be abolished, either immediately or gradually.

“3. That to the Commander-in-Chief should be assigned, as at present, the duties of maintaining discipline in the army and of recommending officers for promotion.

“4. That the field artillery should be largely increased, according to the example of Prussia.

“5. That a sufficient store of powder should be provided both for artillery and infantry.

“6. That the recruiting of privates for the artillery should be stimulated by bounty.

“7. That the term of service, both for infantry and cavalry, should be for seven years, and for artillery for ten years.

“8. That a service of twenty-one years should entitle the soldier to a pension of 9*d.*, and of twenty-four years of 1*s.* a day.

“9. Militia.—That the militia should be raised by ballot, according to the old militia laws, for service in the United Kingdom only.

“10. That in the first week of May in each year every regiment of militia should be called together, and the number willing to volunteer for the army should be registered. That the services of not more than two-thirds of the men willing to volunteer for the army should be accepted. The places of those accepted to be filled up by ballot in the month of October succeeding.

“11. The commissions of subalterns in the militia to be given as at present by the Lord-Lieutenant, but all promotions to commissions of captain, major, lieutenant-colonel, and colonel to be granted by the Commander-in-Chief of the army.

“12. Volunteers.—Every volunteer who wishes to be entitled to a grant of money, clothes, or arms from the Treasury, to sign an engagement to attend — days in the year the meeting of his corps, or in default to pay a fine for absence.”

It is unnecessary to cite further the extra-parliamentary utter-

ances upon this subject; but one fact is worth quoting, as showing the view taken by the people in some quarters of the purchase-system. Mr. Muntz, the Member for Birmingham, who had been on the Commission of Inquiry into that system, told his constituents, while condemning it utterly, that it would cost 7,000,000*l.* to abolish it in an equitable manner. He explained this to them with great clearness and some peremptoriness, and asked them to tell him clearly whether they were prepared to pay the money. The question was put in the most formal manner to the meeting, and elicited an absolutely unanimous vote. Not a single hand was raised in objection, though the pecuniary difficulty had been most forcibly explained.

Among the minor matters of the moment must not be forgotten the serious small-pox epidemic which prevailed in London. It increased slowly through 1870—rapidly from November, 1870, to January, 1871—till the number of cases under the administration of the Poor Law Board increased from 300 at the beginning of November to more than 900 at the beginning of January.

In a report of the Registrar-General, it was declared that it had not been so virulent in London for fully thirty-one years. In the severe visitation of 1840-1 the weekly average number of deaths was only seventy-one, whereas in the present epidemic the average number of deaths weekly was for a long time 152. The ravages of the disease were at one time great even in the West End, where vaccination was resorted to by almost every family. Small-pox showed a considerable increase in the north of the metropolis. In seven weeks of the first quarter the deaths from the disease in London were 1184, and the greater number of these occurred under twenty years of age.

The visitation found us unprepared as ever; and cabs, omnibuses, and hospitals did their best to spread the disease, which had at last to die out as it came, "of itself."

Meanwhile the Parliamentary Session was opened on the 9th of February by her Majesty the Queen, though her speech was, as in previous years, read by the Chancellor, amid a general sense of disappointment. As the Chancellor proceeded, the Queen sat with eyes cast down, and almost absolutely still, a single slight movement of the fan being all that was at any time perceptible.

"My Lords and Gentlemen,—"

"At an epoch of such moment to the future fortunes of Europe, I am especially desirous to avail myself of your counsels.

"The war which broke out in the month of July, between France and Germany, has raged, until within the last few days, with unintermitted, and likewise with unexampled, force; and its ravages may be renewed, after but a few days more, unless moderation and forethought, prevailing over all impediments, shall sway the Councils of both the parties whose well-being is so vitally concerned.

"At the time when you separated, I promised a constant atten-

tion to the subject of neutral obligations; and I undertook to use my best endeavours to prevent the enlargement of the area of the war, and to contribute, if opportunity should offer, to the restoration of an early and honourable peace.

"In accordance with the first of these declarations, I have maintained the rights and strictly discharged the duties of neutrality.

"The sphere of the war has not been extended beyond the two countries originally engaged.

"Cherishing with care the cordiality of my relations with each belligerent, I have forborne from whatever might have been construed as gratuitous or unwarranted interference between parties, neither of whom had shown a readiness to propose terms of accommodation such as to bear promise of acceptance by the other.

"I have been enabled, on more than one occasion, to contribute towards placing the representatives of the two contending countries in confidential communication; but, until famine compelled the surrender of Paris, no further result had been obtained.

"The Armistice now being employed for the convocation of an Assembly in France has brought about a pause in the constant accumulation, on both sides, of human suffering, and has rekindled the hope of a complete accommodation. I pray that this suspension may result in a Peace compatible, for the two great and brave nations involved, with security and with honour, and likely therefore to command the approval of Europe, and to give reasonable hopes of a long duration.

"It has been with concern that I have found myself unable to accredit my Ambassador in a formal manner to the Government of Defence which has subsisted in France since the Revolution of September; but neither the harmony nor the efficiency of the correspondence of the two States has been in the smallest degree impaired.

"The King of Prussia has accepted the title of Emperor of Germany, at the instance of the chief authorities of the nation.

"I have offered my congratulations on an event which bears testimony to the solidity and independence of Germany, and which, I trust, may be found conducive to the stability of the European system.

"I have endeavoured, in correspondence with other Powers of Europe, to uphold the sanctity of Treaties, and to remove any misapprehension as to the binding character of their obligations.

"It was agreed by the Powers which had been parties to the Treaty of 1856 that a Conference should meet in London. This Conference has now been for some time engaged in its labours; and I confidently trust that the result of its deliberations will be to uphold both the principles of public right and the general policy of the Treaty, and, at the same time, by a revision of some of its conditions in a fair and conciliatory spirit, to exhibit a cordial co-operation among the Powers with regard to the Levant.

"I greatly regret that my earnest efforts have failed to procure the presence at the Conference of any representative of France, which was one of the chief parties of the Treaty of 1856, and which must ever be regarded as a principal and indispensable member of the great Commonwealth of Europe.

"At different times several questions of importance have arisen, which are not yet adjusted, and which materially affect the relation between the United States and the territories and people of British North America. One of them in particular, which concerns the Fisheries, calls for early settlement, lest the possible indiscretion of individuals should impair the neighbourly understanding which it is on all grounds so desirable to cherish and maintain. I have, therefore, engaged in amicable communications with the President of the United States. In order to determine the most convenient mode of treatment of these matters, I have suggested the appointment of a joint Commission; and I have agreed to a proposal of the President that this Commission shall be authorized at the same time, in the same manner, to resume consideration of the American claims growing out of the circumstances of the late war. This arrangement will, by common consent, include all claims for compensation which have been, or may be, made by each Government, or by its citizens, upon the other.

"The establishment of a Prince of the House of Savoy on the throne of Spain, by the free choice of the popularly-elected representatives of the Spanish nation, will, I trust, ensure for a country which has passed with so much temperance and self-control through a prolonged and trying crisis the blessings of a stable Government.

"I am unhappily not able to state that the inquiry which was instituted by the Government of Greece into the history of the shocking murders perpetrated during the last spring at Dilessi has reached a termination answerable in all respects to my just expectations, but I shall not desist from my endeavours to secure the complete attainment of the objects of the inquiry. Some valuable results, however, have in the meantime been obtained, for the exposure and the repression of a lawless and corrupting system, which has too long afflicted the Greek Peninsula.

"The anxiety which the massacre at Tien-tsin on the 21st of June last called forth has happily been dispelled; and while it will be my earnest endeavour to provide for the security of my subjects and their trade in those remote quarters, I count on your concurrence in the policy that I have adopted of recognizing the Chinese Government as entitled to be dealt with in its relations with this country in a conciliatory and forbearing spirit.

"The Parliamentary recess has been one of anxious interest in regard to foreign affairs. But I rejoice to acquaint you that my relations are, as heretofore, those of friendship and good understanding with the Sovereigns and States of the civilized world.

"Papers illustrative of the conduct of my Government in relation

to the several matters on which I have now summarily touched will be laid before you.

"In turning to domestic affairs, I have, first, to inform you that I have approved a marriage between my daughter Princess Louise and the Marquis of Lorne, and I have declared my consent to this union in Council.

"Gentlemen of the House of Commons,—

"The revenue of the country flourishes, and the condition of trade and industry may, though with partial drawbacks, be declared satisfactory.

"The estimates for the coming year will be promptly laid before you.

"My Lords and Gentlemen,—

"The lessons of military experience afforded by the present war have been numerous and important.

"The time appears appropriate for turning such lessons to account by efforts more decisive than heretofore at practical improvement. In attempting this you will not fail to bear in mind the special features in the position of this country, so favourable to the freedom and security of the people, and if the changes from a less to a more effective and elastic system of defensive military preparations shall be found to involve, at least for a time, an increase of various charges, your prudence and patriotism will not grudge the cost, as long as you are satisfied that the end is important, and the means judicious. No time will be lost in laying before you a Bill for the better regulation of the army and the auxiliary land forces of the Crown, and I hardly need commend it to your anxious and impartial consideration.

"I trust that the powerful interest at present attaching to affairs abroad, and to military questions, will not greatly abate the energy with which you have heretofore applied yourselves to the work of general improvement in our domestic legislation.

"I commend anew to your attention several measures on subjects which I desired to be brought before you during the last Session of Parliament, but which the time remaining at your disposal, after you had dealt with the principal subjects of the year, was not found sufficient to carry to a final issue.

"I refer especially to the Bills on Religious Tests in the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, on Ecclesiastical Titles, on the Disabilities of Trade Combinations, on the Courts of Justice and Appeal, on the Adjustment of Local Burdens, and on the Licensing of Houses for the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors.

"The inquiry made by a Committee of the Commons House being now complete, a measure will be placed before you on an early day for the establishment of Secret Voting.

"A proposal is anxiously expected in Scotland for the adjustment of the question of primary education. With reference to the training of the young in schools on a national scale and basis, that portion of the country has especial claims on the favourable considera-

tion of Parliament; and I trust the year may not pass by without your having disposed of this question by the enactment of a just and effective law.

"The condition of Ireland with reference to agrarian crime has, in general, afforded a gratifying contrast with the state of that island in the preceding winter; but there have been painful though very partial exceptions.

"To secure the best results for the great measures of the two last Sessions which have so recently passed into operation, and which involve such direct and pressing claims upon the attention of all classes of the community, a period of calm is to be desired; and I have thought it wise to refrain from suggesting to you at the present juncture the discussion of any political question likely to become the subject of new and serious controversy in that country.

"The burdens devolving upon you as the great Council of the nation, and of this ancient and extended Empire, are, and must long continue to be, weighty. But you labour for a country whose laws and institutions have stood the test of time, and whose people, earnestly attached to them, and desiring their continuance, will unite with their Sovereign in invoking upon all your designs the favour and aid of the Most High."

The Address in answer to the Speech was moved in the House of Lords by Lord Westminster, and in the Commons by Major Hamilton, and seconded by Lord Rosebery in the Upper and Mr. Samuel Morley in the Lower House. There was little to call for notice in the debates on the Address. The Duke of Richmond reserved his opinion upon the course taken by the Government with respect to the state of affairs upon the Continent; but criticized, although without acerbity, some of the passages of the Speech, especially with reference to the Circular of Prince Gortschakoff and the absence of France from the Black Sea Conference.

Lord Granville referred with much feeling to his friendly personal relations with both France and Germany. As Foreign Secretary, however, he said that it had been his paramount duty to lay aside all personal feelings, and to maintain a fair and impartial neutrality, although, unluckily, his cordiality for both the belligerents had been deeply resented by each.

In the House of Commons, Mr. Disraeli plunged at once into a discussion on the state of foreign affairs. His speech was laboured, but picturesque. He returned again to his favourite notion, that we ought to have used the guarantee to Prussia of her Saxon provinces, given by us in the Treaty of Vienna, as a means of frightening France out of the war before it began. He insisted that we ought to have made much more of the concession obtained from Prussia as to the Hohenzollern candidature, and have told Louis Napoleon that if in the face of that concession secured by us, he did not withdraw his demand for a formal veto on the Hohenzollern candidature, he would be guilty of an "outrage" on England, and must "take the consequences,"—which consequences were not, however, to be war. He rallied the

Government for its attenuated armaments, which rendered an "armed neutrality" on our part so difficult. He complimented Mr. Childers and Mr. Cardwell on having quite justified the confidence reposed in them on their appointment to office that they would reduce the naval and military strength of England to the utmost of their ability; and Mr. Lowe on his "harum-scarum budgets." He ridiculed our action in the case of the Russian Note, and said he believed there was a secret treaty between Germany and Russia on the subject, which made our appeal to Count Bismarck as undignified as it was simple. He depicted the "cynical cordiality" with which the Count offered to assist us by proposing a Conference, in which, as a matter of course, Russia's high-handed proceeding was first of all condoned. He laughed at the Government for being represented on the Roman question by "the honourable Member for Perth" (Mr. Kinnaird); reproved the Americans for the "rough simplicity of their Republican manners" and their unmannerly conduct to England, though ironically intimating that they had no doubt "improved upon our language;" and he finished his clever disquisition on Foreign Affairs by depicting the position of England as one of enormous peril.

Mr. Gladstone's reply was, of course, nearly limited to the points touched by Mr. Disraeli. He declared the Ministry had no knowledge of the coming storm before it broke; pointed out that the armaments had really been greatly increased in efficiency since the Conservatives went out in 1868; twitted Mr. Disraeli on the close resemblance between his conception of a "bloated armament" in 1861, and his conception of an "attenuated armament" now; confuted him as to the binding character of the guarantee of Prussia's Saxon provinces given in 1815, out of his own Government's exposition of the character of a joint guarantee as exemplified in the Luxemburg guarantee of 1868; declared, with relation to the Russian Note, that neither Lord Clarendon nor Lord Palmerston had ever believed that the neutralization of the Black Sea could be more than temporary; told the House that we should not have had *a single* ally among the neutral Powers if we had proposed simply to insist on this neutralization when the Russian Note appeared, as Austria was entirely opposed to that course; denied that we had made any sort of special appeal for help to Germany, having merely notified our course to Germany as to other Powers; and after declaring that he did not see any special or near peril to England, avowed his wish to make England strong, and admitted the possibility that the neutrals might be compelled to express an opinion as to the terms of peace, which his Cabinet had already advised the German Government to declare at once.

The first nights of the session were, as was to be expected, devoted chiefly to the great Continental War, the peace which had now been virtually concluded by the surrender of Paris, and the grave diplomatic transactions in which the English Government was directly concerned. These subjects, however, caused no serious parliamentary

discussion. It was undoubtedly judicious to abstain from comments which could have exercised no influence on the policy of Germany or on the fortunes of France ; and the results of the Black Sea Conference, and of the Joint High Commission at Washington, were practically beyond the control of Parliament. But the surprising admission attributed to Lord Palmerston by the Premier with respect to the neutralization of the Black Sea led to a passage at arms between him and Mr. Disraeli about a fortnight later. Mr. Disraeli began by explaining that his object was not to enter into the general policy of the Treaty. He wished to discover what was the object of the Conference, which was covered with so much ambiguity and mystery, and also to vindicate the accuracy of his statement on the first night that the neutralization of the Black Sea was the vital part of the Treaty of 1856. To prove this he recounted the history of the negotiations at Vienna, and the famous "Four Points," maintaining that the Cabinet of Lord Palmerston, including Lord Clarendon and Lord Russell, continued the war for a whole year solely for the purpose of obtaining this condition, and that it was the gist of the Peace of Paris : and the policy of the British Government had never changed—at least until the end of last November. Mr. Disraeli then passed on to consider how his observations on the opening night had been met by the Prime Minister, particularly his declaration that in the view of the British Government the neutralization of the Black Sea had never been a vital object of the Treaty of 1856, and that Lord Clarendon and Lord Palmerston set no particular value on it. He pointed out that by the connexion of his sentences Mr. Gladstone had seemed to imply that when he opposed the idea of neutralization in 1856 he spoke as a Minister, whereas he was one of a minute and powerless section of distinguished men with no following in Parliament or the country, and he himself the most unpopular of all, because of the lukewarm manner in which he had provided for the war. Without presuming to defend Lord Clarendon or Lord Palmerston, he dilated on the extreme gravity of holding up two eminent statesmen as acting with insincerity at a great crisis, and laughing in their sleeves at their fellow-countrymen. As to Lord Palmerston, the story must have arisen out of some bit of banter with which he had foiled an importunate diplomatist, but it was his solemn conviction that Lord Palmerston had never wavered for a moment on this question. He strongly condemned the assembly of a Conference merely to register the humiliation of Great Britain ; for at the very moment when it was declared that it met without a foregone conclusion there was evidently a foregone conclusion in Mr. Gladstone's mind fatal to the honour of the country.

Mr. Gladstone, after a scornful regret that Mr. Disraeli should have stooped to repeat some paltry accusations about falsifying a date and the like, went on to complain with some warmth that Mr. Disraeli had twisted and misrepresented both his speech and the despatches. He had never denied that the neutralization of the

Black Sea was a vital part of the Paris Treaty, but only that it was exclusively vital. Further inquiry, Mr. Gladstone acknowledged, had shown him that he was wrong as to Lord Clarendon's view of the value of the neutralization condition, but he still believed that Lord Palmerston, while attaching great importance to it, did not think it was one which could be permanently enforced. Proceeding to defend the policy of agreeing to the Conference, he made a sharp attack on the alternative policy recommended by Mr. Disraeli of leaving Russia to take the consequences, which meant that we were to open a new source of controversy at a time when it was important that the utmost harmony should prevail among the neutrals.

It was not intended, nor was it expedient, that the discussion should be further prosecuted, but the Minister's tone, rather than his language, left in the House and the country a painful impression of distrust. The Ministerial diplomacy was but briefly criticized in the House of Lords by Lord Cairns and Lord Salisbury, the former eliciting from Lord Granville the statement that he had reason to believe that Lord Palmerston had in fact regarded the neutralization of the Black Sea as an article of the Treaty of 1856 which could not be permanently maintained.

Lord Salisbury, for his part, endeavoured to prove the decay of our national power and reputation. Such a disquisition would have been useless even if well founded, and the subject was not afterwards resumed. Mr. Auberon Herbert and Sir Robert Peel constituted themselves the spokesmen of the same cause in the Lower House, the former in a sober and statesmanlike, the latter in a bitter and vivacious fashion. Mr. Herbert called attention to the papers relating to the war, drawing from them a conclusion that the conduct of the Government all through deserved the strongest condemnation; and, chiefly, he blamed the "moral neutrality" which had been invented by our Foreign Office—the abnegation of every thing like a wish or an opinion at every stage of the war, and their determination not to act in concert with the other neutrals. He accused the Government of playing towards France the part of a "detrimental"—that is, of having prevented the other neutrals from coming to her assistance; and if the neutrals had acted together, Mr. Herbert firmly believed that peace would have been restored before now. These opinions Mr. Herbert supported by numerous references to what he called "the colourless pages" of the Blue Book. As to the future, he did not wish this country to take up arms, but to express openly and straightforwardly our sense of the great evils which must result from immoderate terms of peace; and a violent annexation of territory was not only an immoderate condition, but would be a "fatal gift" to Germany herself. Mr. Herbert concluded by moving "That this House is of opinion that it is the duty of her Majesty's Government to act in concert with other neutral Powers to obtain moderate terms of peace, and to withhold all acquiescence in terms which might impair the independence of France, or threaten the future tranquillity of Europe."

Sir R. Peel, who professed to treat the question from the English interest point of view, also assailed the policy of the Government as one of "obliteration" and "selfish isolation." It had brought about the humiliation of the character and credit of England, and made all the world ashamed of us. Sir Robert complained strongly of the flight of Lord Lyons from Paris, and in reading some extracts from the Blue Books he made the House exceedingly merry with the mock humility of their tone and of Mr. Gladstone's speeches, which he contrasted with the firm, straightforward language which Lord Palmerston would have used. The House will observe (he said) that in every one of them the word "ventured" occurs in some shape or other. "We ventured" to do this, or "we ventured" to do that:—"We ventured" to disapprove the demand made by France upon the King of Prussia for a prospective engagement respecting the candidature of Prince Hohenzollern for Spain; but then it was our misfortune to fail. "We ventured" (laughter) to appeal to the Treaty of 1856 as to a reference to some competent tribunal for a settlement of the disputes between France and Prussia; but we did not obtain a hearing. This is the language of the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government. (Hear, hear.) Now observe this:—"We expressed in language so respectful" (much laughter and cheering) "that no objection could be taken to it, a hope that Prussia would not have recourse to the extreme measure of a bombardment of Paris." [Mr. Gladstone—"Hear, hear."] But we failed. (Renewed laughter.) Again—"We ventured to favour"—the calling together of an Assembly fully authorized to represent France—I assure the House that I am using the literal expressions of the Government. (Hear, hear.) Again—"We ventured to point out that little good was likely to arise from the multiplication of abstract declarations with reference to the terms of peace." (Ministerial cheers.) I don't dispute the fact, I am only showing now how "venturesome" the Government have been. (General laughter and cheering.) In the next place we "ventured" to suggest to the Government of Germany that it would be conducive to the general welfare if they found themselves in a condition to make known what were the terms of peace which they deemed to be required. This expression "we ventured" occurs throughout the whole of the correspondence, as it is the manner of dealing with the question which is characteristic of the Government. I submit respectfully to the House that it is not the language which Lord Palmerston would have used. (Loud cheers.) Why, this language is unworthy of a great and powerful nation. (Cheers.) In common with many others upon both sides of the House, I am unable to listen to such language patiently. (Hear, hear.) When M. Thiers implored us to show our sense of the long alliance, Lord Granville replied that the Government must judge what was best for themselves, and objected even to an offer of mediation or good offices. Can you conceive such a niggardly policy? (Cheers.) The hon. gentleman concluded by arguing that the uni-

fication of Germany, leading to the establishment of a great military despotism, could not be for the benefit of Europe, and this he illustrated by citing numerous acts of "bitter Vandalism" committed by the Germans during the war.

These speeches called up Mr. Gladstone, who after commenting on Sir R. Peel's verbal criticisms, defended the Government from the charge of having maintained an attitude of "selfish isolation." With this view he pointed to a despatch in the Blue Book to our Minister at St. Petersburg, desiring him to make inquiries as to the possibility of concerted action with Russia, and to the answer received on October 18th, that it was impossible. It was this untoward reception of our overture and the untoward appearance of Prince Gortschakoff's Note immediately after which prevented Lord Granville developing that idea further. While recommending the withdrawal of the resolution Mr. Gladstone admitted that an extorted peace was one of the unfortunate alternatives we had to fear, and that the greater magnanimity shown by the victor the better would it be, not only for France and Europe, but for the future interests of Germany. As to intervention, neither of the belligerents desired it; on the contrary, they rather thought the premature offer of our good offices might be prejudicial. England had no cause to be discontented with her position in Europe, but he warned the House not to set too high a value on the sole opinion of England, for the strength of neutrals' action was that they should all be represented. He reiterated his statement that the conditions of peace was a matter of watchful concern to the neutrals, and added that it would be a noble addition to the great deeds of this country, if it should be able to mitigate the necessarily severe conditions of peace so as to make them conducive to a permanent settlement.

Mr. A. Herbert withdrew his motion, satisfied with Mr. Gladstone's assurances, and the House heard no more of the subject except on one occasion, later in the session, when Sir Charles Dilke moved a vote of censure on the Government for its conduct of the Black Sea Conference; but, although Mr. Gladstone affected to treat Sir Charles Dilke's Resolution as a motion of want of confidence, the indifference of the House and the silence of the leaders of parties afforded a salutary hint to young and ambitious members that they ought not to select great international affairs as opportunities of gratifying their venial or laudable thirst for distinction.

The Army Estimates for the ensuing year, which had been anxiously anticipated, were issued on February 11th. They showed an aggregate vote this year of 15,851,700*l.*, instead of the 12,965,000*l.* asked in 1870, or an increase amounting to 2,886,700*l.*, or nearly three millions. The additional expense was to be thus apportioned:—

The number of regular troops was increased by 19,980 men—5000 artillery, 2000 cavalry, 12,000 infantry, and 1000 to the

subsidiary services of the army. Six batteries—that is, thirty-six guns—were added to the Horse Artillery; twenty garrison batteries were converted into field batteries—giving us 120 additional field guns; and the remaining garrison batteries were strengthened. As a net result, and assuming that all the augmentation went to the force stationed in these islands, we should obtain a regular army of 100,000 men, with 400 guns, for the protection of the kingdom. All the battalions of the Guards, and twenty-three battalions of the Line, were raised to a war strength, “as being the first for active service;” and two companies for transport service and one for supply were added to the Army Service Corps, besides an addition of a “Telegraph Troop” to the engineer train.

As regards the Reserve Forces, the Militia was to be raised to the full strength of its establishment, though not increased. The entire force, however, was to be made effective by drilling and training on improved principles. The Volunteers were encouraged by an additional grant of 73,300*l*. The “First-class Army Reserve,” already in excess of the estimate, was to be again raised to 9000, and the “Second-class Army Reserve”—the Enrolled Pensioners—to be raised to 30,000. The Regular Army was increased, especially in the Artillery, up to a strength of 133,000 men, exclusive of regiments in India. About 30,000 men could be immediately added from the Militia and First Army Reserves, and if the Militia itself was kept up to its full establishment and well trained, that would give us 120,000 men more. Altogether, from 200,000 to 250,000 fighting men, besides the Volunteer Force, would be available for service in these islands.

No idea of compulsory enlistment appeared to be entertained. More than a third of the whole increase on these estimates—in fact, a million of money—was allotted to the provision of guns, gun-powder, gun-cotton, small-arms, torpedoes, ammunition, and the transport services connected with such material.

The new 35-ton gun would be issued to the Navy, a reserve of field guns provided for the Artillery, a new small-arm introduced, transport carriages completed on approved patterns, and new stores of camp equipage supplied for our Camps of Instruction. The ammunition for the new breech-loaders would cost just half as much again as that for the old Enfield rifle, and “pebble powder” would contribute to the increased charge. Nearly 300,000*l*. were to be spent upon engineering services—“surveys of defensive positions around London, and between London and the coast,” torpedo defences, new fortifications, and other works for the protection of our shores.

The Navy Estimates, shortly afterwards issued, showed a net increase over the previous year of 385,826*l*. The total amount of the estimates was 9,756,356*l*., and the net amount, after deducting estimated extra receipts and repayments, was 9,280,356*l*. The items of increase were:—Wages to seamen and marines, 605*l*.; victuals and clothing, 69,345*l*.; Admiralty Office, 4131*l*.; dock-

yards and naval yards at home and abroad, 89,066*l.*; medical establishments at home and abroad, 176*l.*; naval stores, 58,875*l.*; steam machinery, and ships built by contract, 285,543*l.*; new works, buildings, machinery, and repairs, 19,162*l.*; and civil pensions and allowances, 25,103*l.* The items in which a decrease took place were:—Coastguard Service, Royal Naval Coast Volunteers, and Royal Naval Reserve, 9125*l.*; scientific branch, 1691*l.*; victualling-yards at home and abroad, 933*l.*; marine divisions, 1017*l.*; medicines and medical stores, 5550*l.*; martial law and law charges, 673*l.*; miscellaneous services, 9174*l.*; half-pay, reserved half-pay, and retired pay to officers of the Navy and Royal Marines, 72,862*l.*; and military pensions and allowances, 1881*l.*

In accordance with the universal wish and expectation, the Secretary for War (Mr. Cardwell) introduced an Army Regulation Bill at the beginning of the session. The great feature of the scheme was the abolition of the Purchase System, a bold and sweeping reform that the most earnest advocates of the step had not anticipated so soon, and for the gaining of which they would perhaps have preferred a little longer agitation. It was in formally moving the Army Estimates that Mr. Cardwell, in a memorable speech, explained at length the new scheme of Army Reorganization, the object of which, he said, was to combine in one harmonious whole all the branches of our military forces. But, referring first to a few of the most important items in the Estimates, he mentioned that the amount asked for this year (15,851,700*l.*) was an increase of 2,886,700*l.* over last year's votes: but of this at least 1,000,000*l.* would not be required in ordinary times. He defended his administration, also, from Mr. Disraeli's charge of "attenuated regiments," and showed that under these estimates we should have some 497,000 men under arms, say 135,000 regulars (of whom 108,000 would be in this country), 139,000 Militia, 14,000 Yeomanry, 9000 First Army Reserve, 30,000 Second Army Reserve and Pensioners, and 170,000 Volunteers; and in addition to this we had now guns for a force of 150,000 men. Passing, then, to the provisions of the new scheme, the first point to be settled was whether our army should be based on the footing of voluntary or compulsory service, and after examining the arguments on each side, he stated that the Government could not propose a change so distasteful as compulsory service, unless under a greater necessity than existed at present. Agreeing with Lord Derby that it would be cheapest to pay for our military labour, they would not recommend compulsory service, but there would be clauses in the Bill enabling the Government to raise any number of men upon necessity. That being settled, next came the question, how are our forces to be raised? This divided itself into two parts—shall the purchase-system be abolished, and shall the auxiliary forces of the country continue to be under the lords-lieutenant of counties? For it would be impossible for our Army, Militia, and Volunteers to be amalgamated and interchangeable if the officers of one portion were under the Crown and a purchase-

system, while the others were under the lords-lieutenant, and on a footing of non-purchase. It was impossible to stir a step therefore without coming to a decision on these points, and after summing up the arguments for and against the purchase-system, Mr. Cardwell announced, amid loud cheers from his own side of the House, that the Government had determined to propose its abolition. This decision involved the necessity of accepting a system of retirement and promotion by selection as distinguished from seniority, and in addition the payment of a large sum of money by way of compensation, which he calculated would range from 7,400,000*l.* to 8,400,000*l.* After a certain day to be named in the Bill no pecuniary interest would be taken by any one in any new commission: but no officer would be the worse in a pecuniary sense by the abolition of purchase, for the over-regulation, as well as the regulation price would be paid. A commission would be appointed to ascertain the over-regulation price in every regiment, and with money from the Consolidated Fund, would stand in the place of a purchaser to the officer who wished to sell out, to retire on half-pay, &c. The regulations under which this commission would act were minutely explained by Mr. Cardwell, and he mentioned that the number allowed to retire each year would be limited to the average of the last five years. With regard to first commissions, they would be given without purchase to the general public by competitive examination, to subalterns of militia regiments after two years' good service, and, as before, to non-commissioned officers. The selection of officers for promotion would be vested in the Commander-in-Chief, under the guidance of elaborate regulations; and, while promotions in the lower ranks would be regimental, from captain to lieutenant-colonel they would be army promotions, and the period of service would be limited. Mr. Cardwell next explained his proposals for the reorganization of the auxiliary forces, which were to be transferred from the lords-lieutenant to the direct control of the Queen. In every district there would be a colonel of the staff attached to the general for every 15,000 or 20,000 of the auxiliary forces, who would be in command of them and responsible for them. Promotions would be made in the same manner as in the regular forces, and more frequent opportunities would be taken to brigade the militia and volunteers with the regulars, to send the volunteers to camps of instruction (where they would be under the Mutiny Act) to require stricter proofs of competence from officers, and more frequent and regular attendance from the men. Mr. Cardwell mentioned also many other minor changes which it was proposed to make. For instance, the exemption from the ballot in the case of the volunteers was to be abolished, and if a corps was not satisfactorily reported on by the inspecting officer the grant would be withdrawn. With regard to the regular army, steps would be taken to give a local connexion to every regiment, and local centres of training would be established both for the regulars and militia.

Although much dissatisfaction with the provisions of this Bill

was afterwards expressed, this opening statement of Mr. Cardwell was received with general approval. Not so a rider thereto which was shortly afterwards moved by Mr. Trevelyan, who was, perhaps, somewhat to be pitied for thus having, as Mr. Osborne phrased it, his "pocket picked" of his original scheme. That it might not, at all events, be picked of his intended speech, he came forward pending the discussion of Mr. Cardwell's Bill, and moved the following resolutions with reference to army administration:—"That in the opinion of this House no scheme for military reorganization can be regarded as complete which does not alter the tenure of the Command-in-Chief in such a manner as to enable the Secretary of State for War to avail himself freely of the best administrative talent and the most recent military experience from time to time existing in the British army. That the consideration of the cost involved in the abolition of the purchase-system urgently calls for the immediate removal of obsolete and antiquated sources of military expenditure." Pressing his resolutions to a division, Mr. Trevelyan was beaten by 201 to 83.

Mr. Forster introduced a Ballot Bill soon after the commencement of the Session, and before Easter the Bill, by arrangement, was read a second time without a division. Its substance was as follows:—

1. The Bill shall apply to municipal as well as Parliamentary elections.

2. No paper except the official paper shall be used—that is to say, the object of the ballot shall not be defeated by the use of a somewhat similar paper, which would enable it to be ascertained how the vote had been given.

3. The voting-paper shall not be given to the voter until he enters the voting-booth.

4. The voter is not to be permitted to put any mark upon the voting-paper except that which is necessary to show for whom the vote is given; and in the event of that regulation being violated, the vote will be cancelled.

5. The returning officer, as he gives out his paper to each voter, shall impress it with his stamp, the character of which he shall be bound to keep secret, and which shall not be used again until a certain fixed time shall have expired. Then, when the boxes come to be opened, each unstamped voting-paper shall be rejected as void.

6. When a voting-paper has once been put in the ballot-box, the box shall not be opened except under such precautions as shall secure the inviolability of the vote.

7. Where, in a case of reopening the question of the number of votes, it is found a vote is bad, it shall be struck off from the total of the candidate for whom it has been recorded; and also, where an elector tendering his vote finds some one else has voted for him the vote shall be kept aside, and under certain circumstances counted for the candidate in whose favour he had intended to vote.

8. The same penalties shall be attached to personation that now attach to bribery and treating. The candidate shall lose his seat for procuring or attempting to procure personation.

9. Any candidate who does not include all his expenses in his election return, or who with his own hands has paid expenses which ought to have passed through the hands of his agent, shall lose his seat.

10. The use of public-houses as committee-rooms during the progress of elections is prohibited.

11. The old plan of nominating candidates and making the final declaration of the poll is abolished.

12. The expenses of the returning officer shall be paid out of the local rates.

In consequence of the prolonged debates on the Army Bill, it was found impossible to proceed with the Ballot Bill until late in June, when it was accepted by the Commons, but thrown out by the Lords. In February, also, Mr. Bruce brought in his Trades' Unions Bill. Prefacing the exposition of its provisions by a careful survey of legislation on this subject from the Statute of Labourers down to the present time, he showed how the doctrine of combination in restraint of trade had been gradually turned to the disadvantage of workmen and their societies; and, while censuring some of the objects of Trades' Unions, he maintained that their main object, the protection of the legitimate interests of the workmen, was deserving of consideration. The Bill, therefore, would proceed on the principle of putting employers and workmen on a footing of perfect equality. In the first place it would sweep away all the civil disabilities imposed on Trades' Unions, with certain exceptions. For instance, it would establish a system of optional registration (with publication of accounts, &c.), but those societies which registered would have the same privileges as friendly societies of summarily prosecuting defaulters, &c., while those who declined registration would be left to the more circuitous procedure of Gurney's Act. The penal enactments of the Statute of George IV. would be repealed, but certain offences would be retained, defined more precisely, and punished more summarily. Threats and intimidation, for instance, would be limited to personal violence and punished summarily, but only in cases where a man might now be bound over to keep the peace. Molestation and obstruction would also be punishable, and, among other things, would be defined to include acts of personal violence, dogging a man from place to place, hiding his tools, besetting his house or workshop, and the like.

Though at an early period of the session, Mr. Grant Duff failed to procure a large attendance of members to listen to his lucid and exhaustive exposition of the Indian Budget. He drew it from two sources—the actual accounts of the year ending March 31, 1870, and a telegraphic summary of the approximate accounts of the year just ended. In the year 1869-70 India had a deficit of 20,000%.

but for the year 1870-71 there was a surplus of a million, chiefly arising from opium, the income being 51,000,000*l.*, and the expenditure 50,000,000*l.* But the receipts of the year 1869-70 were better than those of the preceding year by 1,638,395*l.*, the great increase being in the land revenue, while the Customs had fallen off, and the opium revenue had decreased by half a million. On the other side of the account there was a comparative reduction in expenditure of 1,254,509*l.*, the chief reduction being in ordinary public works. Passing to the year just begun, Mr. Grant Duff held out the hope that, unless some unexpected calamity occurred, the income-tax would be reduced, and explained the details of the experiment about to be tried of decentralizing Indian finance. As usual, there would be a difficulty in making both ends meet; and Mr. Grant Duff went on to discuss the alternative modes of facilitating this process. A sweeping reduction of expenditure was impossible; but, on the other hand, he pointed out that India has had peace for two years, and no calamities like the Orissa Famine; that successful efforts are being made to foster trade, and to develop the cultivation of cotton, &c. He drew attention, too, to such hopeful signs as the more frequent resort of natives to this country for education, and to the improvements in the administration of justice—an employment in which intelligent young natives specially distinguished themselves.

The House was more interested in a discussion on the Princess Louise's dowry. The Queen's message relative to her marriage having been read, Mr. Gladstone rose to move a resolution granting an annuity of 6000*l.* to her Royal Highness, which, he explained, would be supplemented in Committee of Supply by the grant of a dowry of 30,000*l.* He combated the objections which might be raised to it. In marrying her daughter to a subject, the Queen had not proceeded without the advice of her responsible Ministers, and she had acted in accordance with the womanly and motherly character which had always led her to choose for her daughters husbands on whose principles she could rely. The practice, too, was not a new one in our history; and it was quite agreeable to the usages and social spirit of the country. The provision was not immoderate, compared with analogous grants to the daughters of George III., for instance. Replying to the suggestion that the Crown ought to save out of its income for these purposes, he pointed out that, though the Queen's income was large, its application was to a great extent predetermined; and that during the whole of the present reign, its economical management had been an example to every household in the country. The Civil List, he argued, when settled at the commencement of the reign, did not contemplate provisions of this nature, nor would it be convenient that it should. He pointed out that, though the Crown lands now produced an income only about equal to the Civil List, if they were managed in the same manner as a private estate, they would put the Sovereign in possession of the largest income in the country. What, for

instance, if Hyde Park and the other metropolitan parks were cut up into building plots? But Mr. Gladstone put the proposition on higher grounds, dilating on the political importance of supporting the dignity of the Crown in a becoming manner, on the value of a stable dynasty, and on the unwisdom of entering into too minute pecuniary calculations on such an occasion. The motion was seconded by Mr. Disraeli, and was carried by acclamation. The marriage portion of 30,000*l.* to Princess Louise was carried by 350 against 1.

In the country, however, it must be confessed that the feeling on this subject was not quite so unanimous. At Nottingham the proposed grant had been condemned by a mass meeting, which separated with shouts for the English Republic; and at Birmingham Messrs. Dixon and Muntz could hardly obtain a hearing for their defence of it.

The feeling against the grant among the working classes probably arose chiefly from the Queen's persistent retirement, and the subsequent discovery of the really critical state of her health must have gone far to dispel that feeling.

CHAPTER II.

Further Proceedings in Parliament—The Westmeath Committee—Speeches of Lord Hartington—Mr. Disraeli—Mr. Gladstone—Sir R. Peel—Mr. Osborne and others—Verdicts in Ireland—Debates on the Army Bill—Speeches of Colonel Loyd-Lindsay, Lord Elcho, Sir H. Storks, Sir J. Pakington, Mr. Trevelyan, Lord Bury, Mr. Osborne, Mr. Cardwell, Mr. Disraeli, Mr. Gladstone, and others—Motion of Mr. Mundella—Abortive Measures—The Licensing Bill and the successful opposition to it—The Local Taxation Bill—The Budget—The Match Tax—Its Withdrawal—Increased Income Tax—General Opinion of the Measure—Admiralty Changes—Mr. Goschen—The Dismissal of Sir Spencer Robinson.

THE introduction of a Bill for the suppression of Ribandism in Westmeath and the neighbouring districts was a terrible tribute to the necessities of the moment. The law in Westmeath had been almost entirely superseded by an agrarian conspiracy. The very diminution in the number of reported crimes only proved that terror had superseded the necessity of murder. The Roman Catholic Bishop of the diocese, notwithstanding transparent evasions in his evidence, obviously desired the protection which he was afraid to demand or to justify, and more candid witnesses disclosed to a Select Committee the existence of a state of

anarchy and misrule which required the most urgent and vigorous remedies. The duty of the Government was plain, but Mr. Gladstone could not discharge it plainly. Lord Hartington gave notice of a motion for a Secret Committee, but when the day arrived the Government had been frightened into making the secrecy optional.

Confessing the feelings of painful dismay with which he rose to move for a committee to inquire into "a certain unlawful combination and confederacy" existing in Westmeath and adjoining parts of Meath and King's County, Lord Hartington hastened to explain that the state of things in this quarter was no criterion of the general condition of Ireland. The prevalence of crime in Ireland during the last winter and spring had subsided, and the records of the assizes as well as the constabulary reports showed a marked improvement. He did not ask that this result should be credited to the remedial legislation of the Government, nor did he ignore the unusually large powers for dealing with crime bestowed on the Government by the Peace Preservation Act. The Government had used both the ordinary and extraordinary powers of the law with vigour, firmness, and decision; but while their efforts had been generally successful, Westmeath and the parts immediately adjacent offered a melancholy exception; and of this region he drew a terrible picture:—"In 1869 there were two murders and two attempts to murder in Westmeath; in 1870 there were four murders and seven attempts; there were during the past winter three murders and two attempts; and in January of this year there occurred one further attempt to murder. In King's County there were in 1869 one murder and one attempt to murder, in 1870 two attempts, and in January 1871 one attempt. In Meath, I am happy to say, there have been no serious crimes. But I have reason to suppose that part of Meath is as much subject to the Riband conspiracy as any part of Westmeath or King's County. All these acts of violence are, we have reason to believe, the work of the Riband Society. The reports which we receive show that such a state of terrorism prevails that the society has only to issue its edict to secure obedience; nor has it even to issue its edict; its laws are so well known, and an infringement of them is followed so regularly by murderous outrage, that few indeed can treat them with defiance. Riband law and not the law of the land appears to be that which is obeyed. It exerts such power that no landlord dare exercise the commonest rights of property; no farmer or other employer dare exercise his own judgment or discretion as to whom he shall employ; in fact, so far does the influence of the society extend that a man scarcely dare enter into open competition in the fairs or markets with any one known to belong to the society." This reign of terror was not due to any remissness on the part of the Government. They had exercised the extreme powers of the law. The police force had been strengthened at the expense of the district, patrols established, detectives employed, and numerous arrests made. Some of

the worst characters had been almost constantly watched, but so perfect was the organization of the conspiracy that the Riband leaders could concert measures and project a scheme of retaliation by the meeting of two or three men in the road or in the middle of a fair. Loud Opposition cheers emphasized the marquis's declaration that this state of things was altogether intolerable, and that it must not be dealt with in haste and panic, for there had been "quite enough of hasty legislation." They did not ask for a committee to provide them with a remedy; it was their own duty to do that. A committee was wanted only in order to secure a thorough investigation of the case, and to satisfy the House that when the Government asked for any further powers, their demand was justified by necessity. He held that the House would be evading the responsibility which properly fell to it, if they were to accept the word of any Minister on such a matter without inquiry. It had in the first instance been thought desirable that the committee should have the power of giving gentlemen who might be willing to be examined the protection of secrecy; but he confessed that the precedents of such years as 1812 and 1818 were not derived from the best periods of our history, and the Government were quite willing to leave the question of secrecy to be determined in the event of the committee applying for it. As to the general propriety of such an inquiry, he referred to the precedent of 1852, when Attorney-General Napier obtained a similar committee in regard to Armagh, Monaghan, and Louth. That the recent legislation of the Government had not put a stop to Ribandism was no argument against such legislation. He certainly did not appear in the white sheet of a penitent, or admit that his proposal involved any confession of failure on the part of the Government.

Contrasting the opening and the closing sentences of the marquis's speech, Mr. Disraeli remarked that his "dismay," however natural when viewing the result of two years of constant legislation, was not consistent with the assurance that there was nothing in the present state of Ireland which was not to be expected. If that were the case, why should the noble lord be dismayed? He should have plucked up his courage. He should have come forward not as a daunted, but rather as a triumphant Minister. He should have said, "It is true that murder is perpetrated with impunity; it is true that life is not secure, and that property has no enjoyment and scarcely any existence; but this is nothing when in the enjoyment of abstract political justice—and by the labours of two years we have achieved that for Ireland; massacres, incendiarism, and assassinations are things scarcely to be noticed by a Minister, and are rather to be referred to the inquiry of a committee." But this committee, it was now announced, was not to be secret, and was not to devise means for remedying these evils. Under the Act of last year the Government had already much greater powers than any parliamentary committee possessed, and the House would support

them in any demand for further authority if they required it. But as for a committee on such a matter, there was one always in existence, and that was the Cabinet, who had the best information, and whose business it was to act upon it. In his distress the Chief Secretary must needs dig up the poor, weak Government of 1852, and cite Mr. Napier's committee. "If," said Mr. Disraeli, amid loud and renewed cheers, "I had had a majority of 100 behind my back, I would not have moved for that committee." But how stood the case now? The First Minister persuaded the country that with regard to Ireland he had the philosopher's stone in his pocket, and was accordingly returned with an immense parliamentary majority. Had any thing been grudged him? Time, labour, devotion, whatever had been demanded, had been accorded, whatever had been proposed had been carried. Under his influence and at his instance we had legalized confiscation, we had consecrated sacrilege, we had condoned high treason, we had destroyed churches, we had shaken property to its foundation, and we had emptied gaols; and now he could not govern a county, and he must come to a parliamentary committee. The right hon. gentleman, after all his heroic exploits, and at the head of his great majority, was simply making Government ridiculous.

The leader of the Opposition was vehemently cheered by his party, and a certain excitement pervaded the assembly, while from the Liberal benches Mr. Serjeant Sherlock, resenting the reference to his constituents in King's County in the motion, moved the previous question; and Mr. G. E. Browne, also a Liberal, delivered his maiden speech against the Government. Mr. Downing also opposed the motion for a committee. The only members on that side (not in the Government) who supported it were Mr. Gregory, who refused to believe that party spirit, however strong, would lead any member of the House to tamper with assassination, and Mr. Agar-Ellis.

Mr. Hardy taunted the Irish Secretary with having to take out of the fire the chestnuts which were too hot for his predecessor's fingers. Fastening on a statement by Mr. Gregory that the contrivers and perpetrators of these outrages were perfectly well known to the police, he denounced the wanton delay and cruel mockery of a committee in dealing with such a state of things. If they would only suspend the Habeas Corpus Act they could to-morrow lay hands on the authors and instigators of these crimes. He felt so strongly upon this question that if the Government would only do something, he would even—although he thought it was cowardly and dishonourable for them to ask for it—give them their committee. As it was, the Government was only making itself contemptible.

Mr. Hardy's vigorous attack called up Mr. Chichester Fortescue, who insisted, amid loud cries of "Oh," that Ireland was never so prosperous, so calm, so contented and prosperous and loyal as at this moment, though he knew there were some members who hoped

for the failure of the measures that had been passed. He appealed to the Opposition not to be misled either by the passionate and genuine partisanship of Mr. Hardy or the more calculating partisanship of their leader.

Lord Sandon opposed the committee, and after an adjournment the debate was resumed by Colonel W. Patten, who adopted a studious moderation of tone, and not abandoning the hope that the Government might yet be induced to withdraw this motion, abstained from imputing to them any improper motives. He professed himself ready to give the Government all means necessary for the repression of crime; but, amid expressions of approval from both sides of the House, implored the Prime Minister to adopt a course which was still open to him to take with honour, and to withdraw this proposal.

Mr. Gladstone, while admiring the moderation of tone displayed by the hon. member for North Lancashire (Colonel W. Patten) felt compelled to characterize his recommendation as one which the Government could not, consistently with their sense of public duty, adopt. Referring to the speeches of Mr. Hardy and Mr. Disraeli, the right hon. gentleman described them as highly coloured by party feeling; and, attributing to Mr. Hardy the impression that forcible language meant forcible ideas, congratulated himself that Mr. Disraeli's assertion, that under his influence the Government had legalized confiscation and consecrated sacrilege, was more moderate than his declaration in 1868, that the disestablishment of the Irish Church would be equivalent to a foreign conquest. This committee was asked for by the Government to assist them in the full elucidation and establishment of facts; and if it was necessary to the protection of individuals, they would not shrink from asking the House for authority to restrain not only the publication of evidence, but the entry of members into the committee-room. The necessity for the committee arose in great part from the fact that they desired to prove not only acts that were done but acts that were not done, and to show how the system of terrorism was applied to all the transactions of private life. This information could not be communicated merely upon the authority of the officers of the Government, and they expected to obtain valuable information from persons who were accurately informed, but who would not venture to give evidence unless they were protected against its publicity. He reproached Mr. Disraeli for the admission that in the year 1852 he did not adopt the means which he believed most suitable for the protection of life and property in three counties of Ireland, because his Government was weak; that because he sat on the Treasury Bench, and wanted to sit there, he did not propose the measures which the situation demanded, and this was the most successful "hit" in his speech. Upon the question of precedent, he did not shrink from citing the instances of 1812, 1817, and 1818. And in answer to the argument that those were "bad times," he replied that their badness consisted in the fact that the House of Commons was

subservient to the Ministry, and that the Government did not sufficiently confide in the House. The appointments of those committees were therefore exceptions to the badness of the times, and might well be quoted as precedents for this proceeding. The only remedy suggested by his opponents, the right hon. gentleman alleged, was the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act; and, abstaining from any recognition of the necessity for such a measure, which, he pointed out, had never been adopted in the case of ordinary crime,—that was crime against persons, and not against the State,—he maintained that it was the duty of the Government to ask the House of Commons to exchange counsel with them, and expressed a confident hope that the present proposal would receive the approval of the reflecting and deliberate judgment of the House.

Mr. Chaplin, who declared the explanation of the Prime Minister to be most unsatisfactory, called attention to the fatal effects of delay in a matter so pressing as the state of Westmeath, and asked who was the guiding spirit that inspired the vacillating policy of the Government.

Sir Robert Peel was very generally cheered in pronouncing the motion to be a gross mistake, and desired somebody to get up from the Treasury Bench, and state in an unmistakable manner—not in vague words, entertaining to listen to, but too vague to understand—whether the committee was to be secret or not. He contrasted the language of the present and late Irish Secretary, and if Mr. Fortescue's description of the condition of Ireland were correct, why should she be held up to the reprobation of Europe as a country teeming with assassination, and only to be dealt with by extraordinary means. He ridiculed the idea of an inquiry, for which no Irish member, he anticipated, would dare to vote, and could only account for it by some dissension or some under-current in the Cabinet—at any rate, he entirely acquitted Lord Hartington of all responsibility for it. Sir Robert went on to indulge in some amusing strictures on the inconsistencies of the Government. I want to point out to the House the position we are in (said the hon. baronet), because the policy of the Government, not only on this question but on a great many others that come before us, exhibits a series of contradictions, of compromises, commissions, and committees that really are most perplexing. ("Hear," and a laugh.) I have been in this House for now a quarter of a century, but I never recollect a Government conducted on such principles before. Every one admits that last year was a session of compromises; this year we have nothing but commissions and committees to inquire into different matters. Last year the Prime Minister announced a policy of complete religious equality and the full development of civil and religious liberty. This year it seems the Minister, under royal authority, supports the spirituality of the Pope, who condemned as heresy these same principles of civil and religious liberty. Then just consider the position of Ireland with regard to the Land Bill. The right hon. gentleman the member for Louth told his

constituents the other day that he hoped the landlords of Ireland were beginning to understand the effect of the measure; and the right hon. gentleman the member for Limerick, in a speech to his constituents, said it was merely a compromise, to be followed by other enactments. Lord help the Irish landlords, say I. (Cheers and laughter.) We may, and I think we shall, have a very stormy session, and no doubt the Government are preparing for it by shunting as much as possible of public business into commissions and committees. We had hoped when the present Government came into power two years ago that they would propose measures for the good of Ireland. The half of Ireland is disaffected, while the whole of the population is dissatisfied. (Cheers.) I am bound to say I cannot think that Ireland is contented. I cannot think she is satisfied. I do not think your policy—the policy of this country for seventy years—has been what it should be for Ireland, and I want to recommend a plan which I think would be infinitely preferable. I want to make a suggestion to the House and to the country. Why should not the House of Commons give an estate in Ireland to the Prince of Wales? (“Hear, hear,” and a laugh.) Why should not the heir to the Crown go to Ireland occasionally? The Irish people know nothing whatever of Royalty, nothing whatever of the influence of the Crown; and I am bound to say, I think it would produce the most beneficial result if steps were taken for introducing a proposal of that kind. (Hear.) In common with every man who considers the state of Ireland, I do want to see Ireland contented; I do want to see her satisfied; and I feel convinced that you must adopt another policy from that which the Government have been pursuing for the last two years to attain such a result; and I do think, I do in my conscience believe, that if some such suggestion as I have thrown out as regards bringing a member of the royal family into Ireland at different times were carried into execution—I do think it would recommend itself to the favourable judgment of this country, and I do believe that more than any thing else it would have the effect of enlisting in favour of Imperial interests the kindly sympathies and generous hearts of the Irish people. (Cheers.)

Mr. O'Reilly was reluctantly compelled to vote against the motion; but Mr. Mitchell Henry, the new member for Galway, in a straight-forward, unpretending maiden speech, expressed his fear that many persons of position in Westmeath were compelled to pay black-mail in order to preserve their lives, and promised his support to the Government. Mr. W. Johnstone, while declaring his uncompromising opposition to the motion, took occasion to contrast the purity and usefulness of Orangeism with the wickedness of Ribandism; and Sir D. Corrigan, presenting himself as a practical contradiction to Sir R. Peel's affirmation that no Irish member would venture to vote with the Government, asserted that but for the passing of the Irish Land Bill murder would have spread over the land, and the whole night would have been spent in killing

landlords and the whole day in executing tenants. For some time after this the debate ran in a dull, cold stream against the Government; but when

Mr. Osborne rose, the interest of the discussion revived. After describing this proposal as a whim of the Prime Minister alone, and nothing but a screen for Ministerial debility, he attributed the whole blunder to the constitution of the Cabinet, which, owing to the exclusive tastes of Mr. Gladstone, consisted chiefly of "Whig marionettes." In a strain of familiar humour which has often excited, as it now aroused, the laughter of the House, he proceeded to criticize the composition of the Cabinet, as having no relation to what "was called the sister kingdom." This Cabinet (said the hon. member) has lately been whitewashed. That is to say, they have been shuffled, and they come back in the old military position of "As you were." (Laughter.) Let us look at the composition of this Cabinet, at the principle of selection which has been exercised, and which it is proposed to extend to military commanders, and see how successful it has been in this instance. We all know that the right hon. gentleman the First Minister is rather exclusive in his Cabinet society. If he has a preference, that which he does like best are Whig marionettes of the most approved pattern, while the right hon. gentleman holds the official wire. (Loud laughter.) I want to know how far this Cabinet represents the majority of the House of Commons, and how far it represents the feelings of the people of Ireland. (Hear, hear.) Let us look down the list. There are fifteen gentlemen. There have been many turns of the political kaleidoscope, but I have remarked that in every change we get back the old Whig combination, and the effect is—"Naturam expellas furca, tamen usque recurret." The consequence is this—that we have got back the old family party; and, true to old Whig instincts, they are not satisfied with breaking their heads against walls, but they must come down to the House and propose the appointment of a select committee—another wall to knock their heads against. (Laughter.) Now, sir, I attribute the whole of this blunder to the composition of this Cabinet. (Hear, hear.) They are most respectable men, more or less gifted. (Laughter.) I have nothing to say against them as individuals, but what special knowledge have they of the sister kingdom? (Hear, hear.) Now, take them separately. I have not a word to say against the new Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant. (Hear, hear.) I am glad to see a man of his rank and great ability devoting himself to the service of his country, and taking the thankless office of Secretary for Ireland. (Hear, hear.) But I cannot help thinking, when I look through this long and dreary list of gentlemen who bow to the presiding genius, there is written over the doors of the Cabinet, "No Irish need apply." The only man with any special knowledge of Ireland is the right hon. gentleman the member for Louth (Mr. C. Fortescue), and he is a man who, while Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant, gained the confidence and won the hearts of the people

of Ireland. (Hear, hear, and oh, oh.) Now, what has been done with that right hon. gentleman? Why, directly he has achieved success in Irish legislation he has been put upon the treadmill of the Board of Trade. (Laughter.) He has been moved from that country, and so anxious were they to keep any Irishman out of the select and secret committee, that the right hon. gentleman, who has been for years in the confidence of the priests and the people of Ireland—a gentleman who has been waiting in the ante-chamber of the Cabinet—has not been listened to, but has been relegated to the dead-letter office. (Loud laughter.) This is the treatment which Ireland receives from this powerful and popular Government. Now I have the good fortune to represent an Irish constituency. (Hear, hear.) I esteem it a special good fortune. (Laughter.) Now, I am not about to give my vote simply as an Irish member, but I shall give it as an independent member of the House of Commons, because I feel strongly convinced that the course taken by the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government is not only dangerous to the Ministry, but fraught with evil consequences to the House. (Hear, hear, from Mr. Newdegate.) If we are to get into the habit when a Ministry is in difficulty (hear, hear) of listening to a confiding Minister and allow the Government to shift off their responsibility by appointing a select committee, what will become of the country? (Hear, hear.) There was only one man who could form the Government, and only one who can upset it; and I can tell the right hon. gentleman that stronger Ministries than his have been run off the rails by a proceeding like this. (Hear, hear.) The right hon. gentleman may have devoted followers in this House, but there is a power out of the House which will bring that devotion to an end. If the Minister contrives to press this vote upon the House, I feel satisfied that his popularity and power will soon come to a speedy termination. (Cheers.)

The Solicitor-General for Ireland retorted with his usual flow of spirits. The hon. gentleman (he said) complained of my right hon. friend having been appointed to the Board of Trade; but does the hon. gentleman think that my right hon. friend has ceased to be an Irishman because he has become President of the Board of Trade (laughter), and because after being so long Secretary to the Lord-Lieutenant he has been transferred to the treadmill of the Board of Trade? I apprehend that the hon. gentleman would be very glad to work upon that treadmill himself (loud laughter), and I take the liberty of saying confidentially that in less than eighteen months he would not only become a silent but a grateful member of the Government. (Loud laughter, and "Oh, oh," from Mr. B. Osborne.) The hon. gentleman said he was glad that he had an Irish seat in this House, and I would say that it is very well there is a refuge for the destitute. (Loud laughter.) Having gone to Dover, like another famous man (a laugh), he found there no rest for the sole of his feet; in one respect, but in no other, like the dove, he found rest for the sole of his feet in Waterford. The hon.

gentleman is an Irishman *pro re nata*, and he will perhaps be an Irishman until the next general election. (Laughter.) I will say no more as to the speech of the hon. gentleman. If he gives me another opportunity I promise to be more liberal with him. (Renewed laughter.) I have now, sir, a word to say as to the extraordinary speech of the right hon. baronet who sits beside the hon. gentleman, and who, so far as the association of ideas is concerned, ought to be the next person alluded to. (A laugh.) The right hon. baronet told the House that the present Ministry had produced and passed extraordinary measures for Ireland. Did he mean to praise or to blame those measures? (Sir R. Peel—Blame them.) (Opposition cheers.) Well, I can only say that when I was an outsider, I saw the right hon. baronet sitting behind the Treasury bench, and I think I recognized his stalwart form voting for those extraordinary measures. (Laughter.) (Sir R. Peel—I never once gave a vote for either of them. Cheers.) Then why did not the right hon. baronet record a vote against them? (Ministerial cheers.) Why had he not the courage to act up to his convictions? I hope he will hold in his hand the taper of remorse. (Sir R. Peel—Never.) (Laughter.) The right hon. baronet never even spoke against either of the Bills. He was returned to support the Government, and as he never once voted against them, it is too much for him to come forward now, when perhaps a fellow-feeling with the hon. member for Waterford makes him wondrous kind (a laugh), and act the part of an impartial critic of the home and foreign policy of the Government. (Hear, hear.) I shall now, sir, leave this pair of patriotic brethren (laughter) and apply myself to the subject more immediately before the House. He then discussed *seriatim* the various precedents, particularly that of 1852, with some amusing flings at Mr. Disraeli, who was responsible for it, comparing that gentleman's explanation of his proposal to the lean apothecary's plea, "My poverty and not my will consents," and explained that the committee would examine witnesses who would not go to Dublin Castle to give information. It would inquire whether these outrages were committed by illegal combinations, and the reasons for thinking so; and the members of the committee would have the opportunity of testing the evidence by cross-examination. The Government would not shrink from the responsibility of proposing whatever legislation might be necessary, but none would be more delighted if the result should be to show that exceptional legislation was unnecessary for Westmeath. As to secrecy, it would remain in the discretion of the House to grant or refuse to the committee the power of closing its doors as occasion arose.

Dr. Ball recalled the debate to the regions of solemn argument, and energetically condemned the attempt of the Government to shift their responsibility to the shoulders of a committee whose appointment could only be productive of delay, while what was required was prompt and immediate action.

Mr. Maguire moved the adjournment of the debate, to which

Mr. Gladstone objected, and on a division the motion was beaten by 297 to 178. A second motion was made by Mr. H. Matthews to the same effect, which was met by an earnest protest from Mr. Gladstone against a practice so obstructive to public business. Mr. Disraeli declining to countenance it, the motion was withdrawn. The House then divided on the "Previous question," which was rejected by 398 to 26, the great bulk of the Conservatives either leaving the House or voting with the Government. Finally, a third division was taken on the main question—the appointment of the select committee—which was carried (without amendment) by 256 to 175.

A contemporary comment upon this debate was supplied in Ireland by Chief Justice Monahan, who, in addressing the grand jury of the county of Westmeath, said that things were going from bad to worse. The police returns showed three men shot, four lives attempted, forty-five threatening letters, several houses burnt, and five or six cases of cattle houghing. In the large majority of cases the offenders had not been made amenable. He trusted that the proceedings in Parliament would improve the county and restore safety to the inhabitants. After hearing the charge the grand jury adopted the following resolution :—

"The Grand Jury of Westmeath, assembled at the Spring Assizes at Mullingar, feel it incumbent upon them strongly to corroborate the assertion contained in the motion which Lord Hartington has now before the House of Commons, to the effect that a certain unlawful combination and confederacy exists in Westmeath. They endorse this fact as well from their own experience as from evidence before them at the present assizes, painfully confirmatory thereof; and they have further to state that all the measures hitherto adopted in this country for the suppression of agrarian and other crimes, involving intimidation, have proved wholly insufficient, and that an immediate remedy is urgently demanded for a state of things too truly described by Lord Hartington as intolerable."

Nor did the result of the cases tried at these assizes encourage a very confident expectation that the law would be vindicated even in the few instances in which parties were prosecuted. In the first trial, in which four men were indicted for attacking a corn-mill and assaulting a man for taking a situation from which another had been dismissed, the prosecutor refused to identify the prisoner, although he had done so at the Petty Sessions. In the next case, in which a man was charged with entering a farmer's house with arms, and attempting to compel the owner to give up the farm, the jury disagreed. In the more important trial of Lawrence Bray on a charge of attempting to shoot Constable Supple in the village of Raharney, on the evening of the 16th of January last, a verdict of acquittal was returned. The prisoner's counsel suggested in his defence that the outrage was fabricated, and relied upon an *alibi*. At the close of his speech, he was loudly cheered by a densely crowded court.

On the part of the Crown, it was observed in reply that the true state of things was that nobody cared about the solemnity of an oath, that no one thought of honour, and that the people all sympathized with the assassins. It was contended that the *alibi* had been prepared before the attempt was made at all. The Chief Justice, in his charge, left it entirely to the jury to judge whether the prosecutor had an opportunity of identifying the prisoner. In a few minutes they returned into court with a verdict of "Not guilty," which was received with general surprise.

By the side of this trial may be read the story of another which followed it at the Clonmel Assizes, as exhibiting in a striking light the peculiar difficulties which beset the administration of justice in Ireland. A savage murder had been perpetrated on the night of the 25th of November, the victim being a decent, well-conducted man named Lonergan, aged about 50 years, who acted as caretaker on the property of Colonel Charteris. His office is not a popular one, but he was an inoffensive man, and was not known to have excited any personal enmity. On the evening of the murder he left the fair of Cahir, and was returning home when he was overtaken by one Tobin, who, without having received any provocation or having any assignable motive for the crime, murdered him in a barbarous manner, and was tried for the crime. In support of the prosecution the Crown had circumstantial evidence to rely upon. It was proved that the prisoner had also been in Cahir, and had bought a quantity of whisky, which was given to him in a brandy bottle. Near the scene of the murder a bottle was found, containing exactly the quantity which was sold to him and exactly the same quality, as was shown by the testimony of a chemist who analyzed it, and, comparing it with the publican's stock, found the same proportion of water in each. There was also discovered near the spot a dark double outer vest, which was stained with blood. A Roman Catholic clergyman was examined to prove that he gave the prisoner a vest, which he believed to be the same. It was shown by the evidence of other witnesses that the prisoner had travelled part of the journey home on two donkey-carts, the owners of which gave him a "lift," and that he took off his coat and left it in one of them, appearing then dressed in a dark sleeveless vest, with a flannel one underneath, with light-coloured sleeves. He was seen in company with the deceased by other persons, and one witness named Kennedy, whose house adjoins the high road, having had his attention attracted by the sound of loud conversation, came out to listen, and heard the deceased say, as if in a deprecating tone, "Are we not all one, Neddy?" to which his companion replied, "I don't care for that." In a few minutes afterwards he heard distinctly the sound of blows. He went to other houses in the vicinity and spoke to three men, one of whom ran up along with him to a ditch, where they listened while the murder was being committed, but made no effort to prevent it. A woman who also heard the sound shut her door and fastened it. After some time they

went out, and found the deceased lying in a field with his skull fractured, and three of his ribs broken and driven into the cavity of his chest. Kennedy saw a waistcoat lying near the place, and took it into his house. Poor Lonergan was carried in, but died in a short time. When the prisoner's house was searched, the police discovered a neckerchief with blood stains on it, and it was this which first led them to suspect him. He attempted to escape to America, and took a passage from Waterford to Liverpool in order to sail from there. At Waterford the police arrested him on suspicion, and telegraphed to Clonmel for instructions, but owing to the delay in the transmission of the message they were not received in time, and there being no authority for detaining him, he proceeded to Liverpool. There, however, he was intercepted, the police having received a telegram before the arrival of the steamer. After considerable difficulty the Crown collected the various pieces of evidence, and had information taken by witnesses, but their difficulty was not ended when the chain of circumstances was complete. Two of the principal witnesses absconded, and if it had not been for the Peace Preservation Act, which enabled the authorities to bring them back, their testimony would not have been available. But their flight was not all. When examined in court they refused to swear up to their informations, and varied from the positive statements which they had already made on oath, so that the Attorney-General called on the Judge to commit one of them for perjury. The reluctance of the jury to convict upon the capital charge was clearly manifested on the first day of the trial, and it needed all the powers of the learned gentlemen who conducted the prosecution with equal zeal and skill to induce them to return a verdict of manslaughter, which Mr. Justice Morris suggested that they were at liberty to find.

The evidence taken before the Westmeath Committee was, fortunately, conclusive; and while their advocates were proving to the House of Commons that certainty of punishment had no tendency to discourage crime, some of the ringleaders among the assassins prudently anticipated the operation of the bill by retiring to America.

The debate on the second reading of the Army Regulation Bill was opened by Colonel Loyd-Lindsay, who moved a resolution declaring that the expenditure necessary for the national defences did not at present justify any vote of public money for the extinction of purchase. He reckoned that the cost of compensating officers in full would be 12,000,000*l.*, of which 5,000,000*l.* or 6,000,000*l.* should be paid at once; that retirement would cost 500,000*l.* a year; and that the whole scale of pay and allowances would have to be revised. He spoke in high terms of the English regimental system, quoting the praise bestowed on it by the Duke of Wellington, Field-Marshal Burgoyne, General Trochu, General Blumenthal, &c. Why should this system be changed? Not for want of officers, for there were 500 who had passed examination

waiting for commissions, of which the Horse Guards had only some 300 a year to bestow; and during the last six months 225 young gentlemen had been allowed to note their names to enter the army, not one of whom was over the age of fourteen. It was the fault of the Government if officers were inefficient, but he denied that they were so. The bill, while involving a vast expenditure and disturbing a series of arrangements which had always worked very well, really left the army as badly organized as before.

Colonel White, seconding the motion from behind the Ministry, declared that the latter had studied their own party interests rather than those of England. They proposed to throw away some ten or perhaps fourteen millions to satisfy the "family mania" of the Trevellyans; but he would rather see the country in a proper state of defence than have some day to trust to the member for the Border Boroughs in the part of Gambetta. The purchase-system, he maintained, was popular, not only with the officers but with the men, because it furnished a class of officers whom they were ready to follow devotedly; and, as to the system of selection, he defied any man to work it satisfactorily. With the proposals as to the militia, Colonel White professed himself quite satisfied, but thought sufficient had not been done for the volunteers.

The resolution was also supported by Colonel C. Lindsay, Captain Stanley, Lord Mahon, Colonel Gilpin, Mr. C. Buxton, Major Arbuthnot, General Herbert, and Captain Talbot, the chief arguments against the abolition of purchase being the stagnation of promotion which it would cause and the impracticability of separating selection and favouritism. On general grounds the Government scheme was also opposed, and on the ground of the waste of money for at the most an equivocal advantage. This was mainly Mr. Buxton's ground; he felt convinced, he said, that after spending all this money we should find that we did not gain what we were seeking, and he could not therefore feel justified in voting for the expenditure of a sum of money which, if applied to the reduction of taxation, would so much add to the comfort of the people.

Mr. Davison (recently appointed Judge-Advocate) argued against the motion. He maintained that the abolition of promotion by purchase was an indispensable preliminary to a reorganization of our military service, and, by way of showing that if it were to be done at all now was the time, he read the latest figures of the sums now paid by officers who purchase all their steps. Acknowledging the value of the regimental system, he denied that the abolition of purchase would interfere with it, and defended the system of selection which was to be substituted for it. He declared that the system of over-regulation prices had grown, and was still growing, to such an extent that if ever there was to be a time for the abolition of purchase that time was now. At the present time the reform could be effected at a cost of from 7,000,000*l.* to 8,000,000*l.* spread over a number of years, but if it was delayed the expense would probably

rise to double or treble the sum, unless a war should intervene, and commissions fall to a comparatively small value. He discussed also the operation of the purchase-system, showing how unjustly and injuriously it bore on the non-purchasing officers, and recommended the change as an absolutely necessary step towards making the service homogeneous.

The Bill was also defended by Sir George Grey, Mr. H. Brand, Mr. Headlam, and Mr. Whitbread. Sir G. Grey held that purchase must be got rid of in order to secure a thorough reorganization of the army. Mr. Muntz and Mr. Headlam were in favour of ignoring over-regulation prices. Human nature (Mr. Muntz said) being what it was, they could not be got rid of permanently; but he would pay down the regulation price at once, raising the money by terminable annuities.

Lord Elcho asserted that for any purpose except the abolition of the purchase-system the measure was an absolute delusion; it was, in fact, a political, and not a national measure; and its only effective provisions had been introduced to silence a hollow sound which arose from the provinces during the winter, and to satisfy a certain portion of the Liberal party. Our duty, he maintained, was to establish such a military system in time of peace as would enable us at a moment's notice to flood the ranks of our skeleton battalions, and give us strength to fulfil our treaty engagements. For this, however, there was no provision in the Bill. The noble lord made merry at the expense of a "young army reformer," who desired to remove the Duke of Cambridge from the Command-in-Chief because he knew too much about the army, and thus made the Secretary of State for War a tool in his own hands; and of a "Radical friend" who, when assured that the Government scheme for the abolition of purchase would cost ten millions down and 500,000*l.* a year for ever, confined himself to the exclamation, "The deuce;" and while ridiculing the efficiency of the ballot for the militia, as proposed by the Bill, and the regulations proposed to be applied to the volunteers, declared that the amendment of Colonel Lindsay did not meet the necessities of the case, and expressed his intention to walk out of the House when the division was taken.

Captain Vivian replied in detail to the criticisms of the member for Haddingtonshire, whom he bantered a good deal upon his professions of independence; suggesting that if he had been present at the deluge he would have declined to enter the ark, and would have insisted upon "paddling his own canoe;" and at the same time reminding him (in reference to an assertion by Lord Elcho that he was the only "unwhipped" member of the House) that when the rod was spared the child was spoiled.

Mr. J. S. Hardy admitted that the scheme for the abolition of purchase dealt fairly with the officers concerned, but as he objected to that step altogether he was compelled to support the amendment. The objections of Mr. Rylands were founded principally upon the payment of the over-regulation prices, and the member for

Warrington suggested, that instead of incurring that expense it would be well to permit the operation of the bonus system.

Colonel Learmonth discussed the question from a military point of view, and, while admitting the anomalies of the purchase-system, maintained that it had acted well, and could not be interfered with without destroying our regimental system.

Sir Henry Storks's first appearance as a debater was entirely successful. His defence of the Government proposals was careful and almost minute in detail, while his reference to the character not only of the officers, but of the rank and file of the army—the officers who under the most trying conditions had always done their duty; and the men who, however obtained, were patient under privations, obedient to their officers, and loyal to the Crown and country—as well as the general tone and temper of his remarks, were cordially recognized by both sides of the House. When he sat down he was congratulated by the Prime Minister and other members of the Government upon the manner in which he had acquitted himself.

Sir J. Pakington protested against the Government measure as a "costly party project and sop to democracy," which would not add one iota to the strength of our defences. He spoke contemptuously of the "trash" circulated by Mr. Trevelyan, who, by dint of continually repeating it, had got to believe it. It was impossible, he held, to have a system of selection without injurious suspicions of favouritism, and practically an adherence to seniority as a general rule. This was the case at the Admiralty. No man could have been First Lord without having his table covered with numerous applications such as this:—"I have always supported Conservative or Liberal candidates" (as the case might be), "and I have a very nice boy, nine years old, whom I want to be a cadet." He defended the Commander-in-Chief against the imputation of favouring men of social rank, and pointed to the fact that one of our field-marshal was the son of a tradesman in the City of London. He was disappointed that the Government had made no provision for a more efficient reserve by connecting the line with the militia, and utilising half-pay officers, and for the adequate equipment and transport of reserves. Sir John promised to vote for Colonel Loyd-Lindsay's resolution.

Mr. Trevelyan replied to the attacks directed against him with characteristic vivacity. He described Sir J. Pakington's speech as an argument not so much against abolishing purchase in the army as for introducing it into the navy. The proposal to abolish the purchase system had been denounced as a democratic notion, but Lord Palmerston said he did not know a more effective way of inducing members of high families to enter the army than by allowing them to get on with greater rapidity than they would by mere seniority. He denied that the military men in Parliament fairly represented the officers of the army; they represented only those who were rich enough to buy commissions and get into the House of Commons. It must not be forgotten how the purchase-system told on men like

Havelock, who declared he was sick for years in waiting for his promotion; that three sots and two fools had purchased over him, and that if he had no family to support he would not serve another hour. He had received a great many letters to the same effect. One of his correspondents, who might be taken as a fair sample of the rest, said he was at the head of a list of four lieutenants, none of whom were in a position to purchase, and they had consequently been purchased over by officers much their juniors. One of these gentlemen had served fifteen years, mostly abroad, and his position was so hopeless as regards promotion that he found himself almost compelled to look out for some other career in which the want of money would not be such a complete barrier to professional success. Arguing in favour of the Government scheme of abolishing purchase, he pointed out that the proposal to pay regulation prices down and leave over-regulation on one side would be a great mistake, for it would be paying for the abolition of purchase without abolishing it. In calculating the cost of a scheme of retirement, which some had put at 500,000*l.*, the 515,000*l.* now paid for a similar purpose in one form or another must be taken into account. Were purchase abolished a great many reforms could be introduced which would prove to be genuine economies, such as a reduction in the number of generals, abolition of army agents and exceptional corps at exceptional pay, &c. He warned the Opposition that if the defeat of the Bill brought on a dissolution, the "Abolition of purchase" would be an excellent hustings' cry. It had been urged that the money would have been much better laid out in the purchase of additional war material. But guns burst and earthworks crumbled into dust, while institutions lasted for ever. The nation had made up its mind to pay the price; and when in future years the questions of service in the ranks, first appointments, and military government became ripe for settlement, it would find that the price had not been paid in vain.

Colonel Brise, Colonel Barttelot, and Mr. Gourley spoke against the abolition of purchase.

Mr. Eastwick maintained that unless we reformed our military system thoroughly at the same time that purchase was abolished we would only be plunging into a fathomless ocean of expense. His advice was—begin by reducing the number of company cadres and of officers to the scale adopted in the Prussian army, and transfer the supernumerary officers in the infantry to the reserve forces. Adopt an elastic system, and divide the 108 regiments of infantry into three battalions each, and then we could mobilise as few of them or as many of them as we pleased.

Lord E. Cecil, while on the whole in favour of purchase, regretted that the debate had degenerated into a mere purchase squabble. The really serious question was as to the reorganization and equipment of the army. In these respects the Government scheme was lamentably defective. While in the Prussian army there were six guns to 1000 men, we were put off with just two-thirds of a gun to 1000 men. Prussia and most of the other Continental

nations had three times the amount of cavalry in proportion to infantry that we had, and twice as many horses. Clearly, we ought to have more artillery and cavalry. Next, some of the recommendations of the Commission of Defence of 1859 might be carried out. Our dockyards should be put in a good state of defence. Military instruction should be provided not only at Aldershot but in the midland and northern counties, and also in Scotland. These things were much more important than the abolition of purchase. He had consulted the officers of fifty-nine regiments on the latter subject, and found that fifty-six—three being non-purchase regiments—were against the Government plan.

The only speakers who at all leaned to the side of the Government were Captain Beaumont and Mr. A. Herbert. But the former declined to vote for the abolition of purchase (to which in principle he was favourable) without more information as to the new arrangements to be substituted for it. And Mr. A. Herbert coupled his approval of the purchase proposals with an expression of dissatisfaction as to the inadequate provision made for reorganizing the army. He hinted that the question would be very seriously asked in this country whether there was a real want for a standing army at all. One of the principal reasons for a standing army was the Irish difficulty, and this would disappear at once if the Irish people were compelled to submit to a short stern course of compulsory service, which would place them in a better position than at present to decide what course was best for themselves.

Lord Bury devoted a considerable portion of a long speech to criticizing the deficiencies of the measure in the way of the reorganization of our military system, for which he maintained that it did really nothing. Turning to the question of purchase, he asserted that the army at present very fairly represents the gentleman-like classes of the country; and condemned the proposal of the Government for the abolition of the existing system, as not only bad in itself, but as sought to be carried out in a manner most unfair and unjust to the officers. The proposals as to the volunteers he characterized as an intimation, conveyed in not the most civil terms, that their services were no longer required.

Mr. B. Osborne, while giving Mr. Cardwell full credit for those good intentions which might serve for the pavement of the House of Commons as well as of "another place," made a severe onslaught upon the measure of the War Secretary, which, he maintained, made nothing clear except that we must have enlarged expenditure and ill-defined estimates, and gave us no prospect of permanent security. Although the member for Waterford discussed this question in a more serious style than is customary with him, he did not altogether abstain from jocosity; and he excited a good deal of merriment by speaking of the four representatives of the War Office in the House—The Secretary of State, the Financial Secretary, the Surveyor-General of the Ordnance, and the Judge-Advocate—as "a noble army of martyrs;" and comparing the speech of one of

these, Sir H. Storks, to the address of another very celebrated general when he took leave of his troops, "Begone, brave army, and don't kick up a row." For the purchase system he professed no admiration, and to its abolition he entertained no objection, but he complained that the Government had given the House no information as to what was to succeed it. At the same time he expressed great distrust of "professional soldiers," and reminded the House that Colonel Pride, who "purged" the House of Commons in 1648, weeded it of all "the philosophical economists" and some of "the professors," and ultimately turned the Speaker out of the chair, was a professional soldier and non-purchase officer, and that the man who "came down to the House" accompanied by 300 men, uttered the memorable words, "Take away that bauble," locked the doors of the House of Commons, and set aside the British Constitution, was a lieutenant-general by "selection." In a "scratch" Parliament like this he had no doubt that the purchase-system was doomed, but if it were to be abolished, the sentence must be carried out at once, and the process of destruction must not be spread over a number of years. As to promotion, he pronounced that "selection" could only be carried out in a despotic country; and as a means of regulating the granting of commissions, he condemned competitive examinations as a system which would have "puzzled Marlborough for want of spelling, puzzled Wolf, and probably rejected Wellington." The question of keeping up the Indian army he thought loomed very darkly for the future, and he wanted to know how, with a system of short enlistment, it was proposed to keep that army up to its proper standard of efficiency. Amid a good many cheers, he recommended Colonel Loyd-Lindsay to withdraw his "nibbling" amendment; and concluded by announcing his own intention to vote directly against the second reading of the Bill.

Colonel Jervis and Lord George Manners opposed, and Sir George Sinclair and Mr. Roden supported the measure, while Lord C. J. Hamilton characterized it as so ridiculously extravagant, and so extravagantly ridiculous, that he trusted that if it were not rejected upon the second reading it would be "stamped out" in committee. Major Anson complained of the deficiencies of the statement of the Secretary of State for War, and the absence of all information as to the arrangements which would be rendered necessary by the abolition of the purchase-system. He made two or three smart debating "hits" at the expense of Captain Vivian, criticized in detail the calculations of Mr. Trevelyan, and finally pronounced decidedly against the Government measure.

Mr. Cardwell proceeded at some length to defend the proposals of the Government. After explaining what would be the effect of these proposals upon the Militia, the Artillery, and the Reserves, he addressed himself to the criticisms of gentlemen who had complained of the omission of various matters from the Bill; and, in reply to them, pointed out that organization would be carried out by royal warrants and the action of the Executive, and that the object of

this Bill was not to organize, but to confer powers upon the Government, and to remove obstructions from their path. Of course no inconsiderable part of his speech was devoted to a justification of the abolition of the purchase-system, and this measure he defended upon a variety of grounds, but mainly upon the beneficial effect which it would have upon the professional training of our officers, indeed, upon the absolute necessity of its adoption, to secure to us really professional officers—men who would follow the army as a profession, and develope military science and skill to the utmost. He showed how hardly the existing system bears upon both purchase and non-purchase officers, upon non-commissioned officers, and upon persons of limited incomes, who desire to place their sons in the army; explained how seriously and effectually it interferes with and prevents all army reforms, and strenuously maintained that, if ever it is to be abolished, now is the proper time for its abolition.

Sir J. Hay maintained that the Bill would not reorganize the army in any sense, but would create obstruction and stagnation. He treated purchase-money as a deposit for good behaviour, not unknown in other professions; and by the experience derived from the navy retirement and other committees on which he had served, he calculated that the combined cost of paying the officers out and providing retirement allowances would add some thirty-eight millions to the national debt. To this he was strenuously opposed at a time when it was urgent to spend three or four millions on artillery. From the same experience he argued that selection would either cause constant irritation or would degenerate into a mere seniority rule.

Mr. Anderson criticized severely the proposed treatment of the Volunteers, and opposed the payment of over-regulation prices. Mr. Hermon, though favourable to the abolition of purchase, declined to support it unaccompanied by a scheme of retirement. Colonel Dyott and Major Walker spoke decidedly against the Bill. Mr. R. Torrens requested some further information as to the details of the expense, while Sir W. Russell and Captain Grosvenor supported the abolition of purchase, but thought the reorganization scheme utterly insufficient.

Mr. Disraeli began by remarking that the events of the last seven months, out of which the Bill had sprung, had led the people of this country to expect something more than the abolition of purchase, although this had been a Parliamentary question for a good many years. There was a general feeling that the security of the empire was not complete, and by this test he proceeded to try Mr. Cardwell's scheme, and how far it came up to his programme—a sufficient army, ample reserves, and the placing of all our military resources under one supreme control; and he maintained that the result of the comparison was very disappointing, particularly in the matter of reserves. This part of the Bill was tentative and trifling—being especially defective in its dealing with the militia, the legitimate foundation of our reserves, which, he feared, might lead to

a falling off in recruiting. In an equally unsubstantial manner had Mr. Cardwell fulfilled his programme of bringing all our forces under one organization. But although the fulfilment of the programme was not so vigorous as might have been anticipated, remembering his pledge at the commencement of the session, he was anxious that the Bill should be read a second time, and that the details, such as purchase, should be dealt with in their proper place. He was disposed to see in the Bill something of the fashionable doctrine of evolution, and to hope that the features faintly adumbrated in the Bill might be developed into substantial legislation. Passing to the subject of purchase, Mr. Disraeli classed it among such questions as marriage with a deceased wife's sister—affairs which go on pretty much as usual, whatever might be the decision. But in the Bill the question assumed a financial aspect, and, therefore, it required more careful attention. If the country had suddenly, in a scrupulous fit, determined that the sale of commissions by the State was wrong, the Ministry was justified in proposing its abolition; but they must be quite sure that the country thoroughly understood the sacrifice it was called on to make. Examining the Government estimates closely, Mr. Disraeli warned the country to be prepared for a much larger cost than eight millions, and if Mr. Lowe a few weeks hence should have to ask for a new tax to pay off purchase, the state of things would become intolerable. But, on the whole, Mr. Disraeli urged Colonel Loyd-Lindsay to withdraw his amendment, which put the question on a false issue. After all, the animus of the Government was good, and this was the first proposal which had been made to weld together the different forces of the empire. He hoped, therefore, to go as soon as possible into committee, where, perhaps, some such common-sense proposal as that of Mr. Muntz might be adopted; at any rate the machinery of the Bill might be made more robust.

Mr. Gladstone, after intimating that the Government would not acquiesce in the withdrawal of the amendment, but would insist on its being negatived, welcomed Mr. Disraeli's speech as an important landmark in history, particularly in its recognition that this was the first attempt to weld together in one organization all our varying forces. In answer to the criticism that the Bill did not come up to the programme of the Government, he pointed out that it only contained so much of the programme as needed legislation. Taking as the standard of our requirements a small army, highly trained, and a large army of reserve ready for service at any moment, Mr. Gladstone went on to show that this would be the product of the Bill. He differed, however, from Mr. Disraeli in thinking that we should draw our reserves from the militia. On the contrary, we ought to have reserves of seasoned men, regularly trained, corresponding to the German Landwehr. Mr. Disraeli's declaration against purchase, for such he assumed his speech to amount to, he hoped would sink deep into the minds of its advocates, and on this point he vindicated at length Mr. Cardwell's estimates, and his decision to sweep the

whole system away by paying off over-regulation as well as regulation prices. Next he dealt with the suggested necessity of an increase of pay when purchase was abolished, which he professed himself utterly unable to understand—pointing out that the officers would be relieved of the dead weight of a mortgage of eight millions, or about 30,000*l.* a year, and asking why should their emoluments, therefore, be increased? The best security for their emoluments and for a fair system of retirement was the necessity on the part of the country of attracting the best men into its army. In an elaborate argument, Mr. Gladstone explained his reasons for disbelieving that the officers of the army would come hereafter from a very different class of society, and for advocating this change as the first step towards drawing together a highly-trained army. Finally, he stated that the Government would go into committee inviting criticism and co-operation, and without any pedantic assumption that they had been able of themselves to make their proposal perfect.

The amendment was then negatived (though Colonel Loyd Lindsay offered to withdraw it), and the Bill was read a second time.

On going into supply on the Army Estimates Mr. Mundella moved, before a very full House, that while approving the abolition of purchase in the army, the House was of opinion that the army might be made efficient without increasing the ordinary estimates. The speech, though robust and very comprehensive in regard to matter, was unambitious in manner, and besides being critical, the hon. gentleman was suggestive, pointing to several improvements in each branch of the military service, all of which, besides a representation of the present pacific state of the world, led up to a decisive assertion of the advisability of a reduction of the proposed estimates. He recommended the formation not only of a militia but a volunteer reserve. His arguments were summed up in a quotation from Lowell:—

“More Men?” More men—that’s where we fail;
Weak things grow weaker yet by lengthening.
What is the use of adding to the tail
When it’s the head’s in want of strengthening?

The motion was seconded by Mr. Pease with a certain energy, and with a fearlessness of any danger to this country. He got a sympathizing cheer from below the gangway when he said that, in the matter of military expenditure, Mr. Gladstone had made his only retrograde step, and had weakened his hold on the opinions of his followers.

Mr. Gladstone next rose, inspired, as he said, by a hope that a statement on the part of the Government thus early might tend to simplify the discussion. He began with particular quietude, and even when he said distinctly that he could not accede to a proposition to take 3,000,000*l.* off the estimates of the year he was not emphatic, though he did deepen the cadence of his tone when he stated

that those who asked that had not proved their case. His assertions were promptly caught up and applauded by the Opposition. He characterized the two speeches which had been delivered as going only to general retrenchment, and not to such items of reduction as would tend to diminish the army charge by 3,000,000*l*. He pointed out that the present estimates were only about 700,000*l*. more than those of 1869-70; and he said distinctly that the present charge was not to be the normal military expenditure, the estimates being transition estimates consequent on the desire of the nation for an extensive change in our military system. He was slightly emphatic when he declined to adopt the doctrine that our military efficiency should be limited by the necessity of self-defence, and that England should bind herself to absolute non-intervention in any case; and was almost solemn when he spoke with doubt of the certain peaceful settlement of European affairs. He went through the details of the augmentation of the estimates with a minuteness of knowledge which a Secretary for War might envy, the object being to show that it was caused by the promotion of efficiency. He concluded with an appeal to those who had hitherto given him their confidence to continue to accord it under exigencies which he conscientiously believed were necessarily evoked by the circumstances of the moment.

The House at once emptied. Very thorough for the motion, both in manner and matter, were Mr. Dixon, Mr. Jacob Bright, and Mr. Candlish (though he was, in part, tenderly regretful at the course taken by the Government), while Mr. Holms spoke in favour of the plan of reserves and the abolition of purchase; but he declared himself against the extent of the proposed expenditure, as not justified by much of their plan of reorganization.

Sooner than might have been expected Mr. Cardwell presented himself, and argued that the increase of the army, reserve, and auxiliary forces was in accordance with the expressed wish of the House: and he dealt with most of the other items of enlarged expenditure.

With unusual animation Sir Percy Herbert replied categorically to some statements of Mr. Mundella as to internal army matters, which he alleged to be erroneous; and, to the uproarious delight of those about him, twitted the Government with not denying those assertions.

Much mirth was caused hereabouts by Captain Dawson-Damer crossing the floor and taking a seat on the Treasury bench between Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Forster, which was renewed again and again when the hon. gentleman appeared to be holding some confidential communication with both those Ministers, especially showing what seemed to be a betting-book to Mr. Gladstone. A division was taken, which resulted in Mr. Mundella's motion being rejected by 294 to 91.

Lord Garlies, balked of his motion disapproving of the Government scheme of army organization, made the speech which was to illustrate it, and then the House went into committee.

During the discussions of the subject of the session, the Ministry found time for some conspicuous failures in other directions.

A Scotch Education Bill was introduced and dropped by the Lord Advocate, who also contrived to ensure the summary rejection of his own Bill for the Abolition of Hypothec. In flagrant disregard of the rule that a legislator should never provoke unnecessary opposition, the Lord Advocate explained that his restriction of the rights of Scotch landlords would furnish a precedent for the abolition of the English law of distress. As he might have foreseen, the English County Members, though unaccustomed to interfere with Scotch legislation, profited by the warning to assist their Scotch friends in throwing out the Bill. Some of the most important Government Bills never reached the stage at which they could have been tested by a Division. Shortly before the Easter Recess, Mr. Bruce moved the first reading of the Licensing Bill, which had been anxiously expected. There were different opinions as to the expediency of its provisions, but from the moment at which it was published, only the merest novices in political calculation thought it possible that it should be passed. The publicans, from their numbers, their wealth, and their intimate relations with the lower middle class and the working population, are necessarily a powerful body; yet in a just cause a Government pursuing the public interest may overrule the opposition of any section of the community; but some of the provisions of Mr. Bruce's Bill were not just, and the convenience of customers was treated with as little regard as the interests of the publicans. Those who were already in the trade were, except in case of misconduct, to retain their licences for ten years; but no increase of the number of public-houses was to be permitted, and after the appointed term the number was to be restricted by general law, subject to a limited power of addition to be exercised by the justices. In future, licences were to be sold by public auction, and a part of the purchase-money was to be employed in the maintenance of a separate police force specially charged with the inspection of public-houses. The auction clause, which was calculated and probably intended to preserve and extend the monopoly of brewers, would alone have been fatal to the Bill. It would have been undesirable to invest in the purchase of the right to exercise a trade the money which ought to be employed in conducting it; and in a pecuniary competition large capitalists would necessarily prevail. It proved unnecessary to discuss a Bill for which no borough member could have voted without forfeiting his seat. That this would be the penalty was abundantly evident by the angry and influential meetings, which were held by the brewers and licensed victuallers in all parts of the country. The newspapers of one and the same day contained accounts of such meetings at Liverpool, Guildford, Kingston-on-Thames, Colchester, Worcester, Kidderminster, Leicester and Preston; and the example was followed in all the principal towns of the kingdom. At the Islington Agricultural Hall, Mr. Winterbotham, among others,

addressed a meeting of between 3000 and 4000 persons connected with the trade, and seconded a motion which characterized Mr. Bruce's measure as a "Robbery Bill," and on the same day a meeting of the United Kingdom Alliance was held in Exeter Hall, when the spacious building was crowded in every part. A few weeks of agitation of this description compelled Mr. Bruce to abandon the Licensing Clauses, and, with unwonted caution, he declined at the close of the Session to pledge himself to the reintroduction of the Bill. The advocates of compulsory temperance, under Sir Wilfrid Lawson, attempted in vain to retrieve their defeat, and Mr. Rylands obtained a nugatory triumph over the victorious publicans by obtaining on the second reading a majority for an impracticable Sunday Closing Bill. Mr. Goschen's Local Government and Taxation Bill excited among those against whom it was directed feelings not dissimilar to those of the publicans, who were threatened by Mr. Bruce, and their resistance was not less effectual. In the early part of the Session Sir Massey Lopes had complained of the exemption of personal property from rating; and an animated debate had closed with a significant intimation from Mr. Goschen and Mr. Gladstone that the Government had fully inquired into the matter, and that it was prepared to introduce remedial legislation. The readers of Mr. Goschen's pamphlet of last year, published in the form of a Report from a Select Committee, were at no loss for the interpretation of his promise or his threat. A Parliamentary paper was soon afterwards issued, containing the result of inquiries into the comparative incidence on land, on houses, and on personality of local and Imperial taxation in foreign countries. Mr. Goschen had ascertained in detail, though he might have taken the conclusion for granted without inquiry, that in many countries land bears a larger absolute share of taxation than in England. In Hungary, for instance, where there is much land and scarcely any personal property, more than sixty per cent. of the taxes are levied on the only kind of property, with the exception of houses, from which it would be possible to extract a revenue. From Mr. Goschen's elaborate tables an estimate of the value of different kinds of property was carefully excluded; and it was evident that the spirit which had dictated a fallacious arrangement of statistics would inspire the legislation which had been foreshadowed by last year's Report. The Bill, when it was produced, proved to be ambitious, comprehensive, and in the highest degree vexatious. Reversing the current of modern legislation, Mr. Goschen proposed to recur to the parish as the unit of local organization; and the chairmen of parochial councils which had no intelligible functions of their own were to form the basis of a kind of provincial hierarchy. Their most important function would have been the assessment and imposition of rates; and it was provided that the constituency should in every case have a conflicting interest with the landowners, who were to be amused by a separate and powerless share in the nominal representation. For the satisfaction of Sir Massey Lopes and the country gentle-

men, or by way of repartee, half the rates were to be summarily and arbitrarily transferred from the occupier to the owner. The disregard of existing contracts which formed a part of Mr. Goschen's former proposal was thought too outrageous to be included in the Bill; but all landowners who had not the practical control of the tenants would at the next letting have been burdened with a payment probably equal on an average to an Income-tax of eighteenpence in the pound. The great proprietors whose accumulations trouble the repose of Mr. Mill would have been untouched by the legislation of his Ministerial disciple; but petty and struggling holders of land would, in many cases, have been ruined, and heavily encumbered estates would have been rendered worthless. Mr. Goschen's scheme was loudly applauded by the semi-socialist and revolutionary part of the community; but the farmers, who were to be bribed into hostility with their landlords, received it in silence; and among those who are interested in the preservation of property there could be but one opinion of its provisions. The Local Government Bill accordingly, like the Licensing Bill, disappeared before the second reading.

But it was reserved for the Chancellor of the Exchequer to make the great failure of the session. The necessity of a large outlay upon military stores, and the proposed abolition of purchase, involved an expenditure for the current year which created on the whole a deficiency of two millions. Immediately after the Easter recess Mr. Lowe brought forward his Budget, in a House not less crowded than usual; but the speech, though amusing in parts, contained less clear exposition and less interesting discussion of theoretic principle than even Mr. Lowe's previous speeches, and as compared with Mr. Gladstone's Budget speeches it was quite dull and lame. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had a very good account to give of the last year's revenue and expenditure, the revenue having amply covered even the excess of expenditure caused by the European war and sanctioned by Parliament before it rose in the autumn, without any fresh taxation. The receipts had exceeded the estimates by 2,311,220*l.* The first estimated expenditure (estimate of the spring) had fallen short of the actual expenditure by 2,245,539*l.*, which was, however, less (by 65,681*l.*) than the increase in revenue. As the original estimate counted on a surplus of 331,000*l.*, there was a total surplus for the last financial year of 396,681*l.* For the future year, the estimated deficiency, supposing no new tax to be added, would be 2,713,000*l.*, which Mr. Lowe proposed to raise by changes in the Probate and Succession duties, yielding 300,000*l.* this year (and 1,020,000*l.* next): by a duty on matches ($\frac{3}{4}$ *d.* stamp on boxes of 100 wooden matches or less, and 1*d.* stamp on boxes of 100, or less, wax matches, because they are "more aristocratic," or 100 fuses) estimated to yield in the first year 550,000*l.*; and an increase on the Income-tax of slightly more than 1 $\frac{1}{4}$ *d.* in the pound (really exactly 10*s.* 8*d.* per cent.), to yield 1,950,000*l.*; which items being added together, give 2,800,000*l.* And as the estimated deficiency

was only 2,713,000*l.*, the estimated surplus, if the new taxes were granted, would be 87,000*l.* In proposing his very high Estimates for the current year, Mr. Lowe so far from groaning over the lavishness of his colleagues, made a very spirited appeal to the country not to grudge the money requisite for such a real reorganization of the army as would make England unassailable even if our fleet were decoyed by a ruse to a distance, as Nelson's fleet was decoyed to the West Indies before Trafalgar. Even in a purely financial point of view, he said, it was quite impossible to over-estimate the importance of convincing the Continental Powers that a successful invasion of England would be a hopeless dream;—such a conviction would bring great stores of wealth here for security, and would enormously increase the credit of this country on all the Exchanges of the world. A very considerable pecuniary sacrifice would be, even economically, more than justified by attaining such a result. The most amusing part of Mr. Lowe's speech was his commendation of the stamp on matches, "not matrimonial engagements," which he proposed to borrow, he said, from America, as a token of admiration of her finance and goodwill towards herself. The cost of matches is so inappreciable that they are wasted in a most reckless and dangerous way, and are often the cause of most serious fires, as when matches are flung down into areas in which dry straw from unpacked hampers is lying. The Americans, who put $\frac{1}{2}$ *d.* on every bundle of 100 matches, had realized 400,000*l.* a year from the tax. In this country the number manufactured is quite incredible,—no less than 560,000,000 *boxes* of wooden matches, and 45,000,000 of wax matches and fusees. Mr. Lowe had devised a motto for the new stamp, "*Ex luce lucellum*" ("Out of light a little profit"),—a joke not appreciated by the great majority of his hearers, who had evidently forgotten that the diminutive of *lucrum* contains no *r*—and he thought this would be more suitable to them than the "rather watery device" of a Noah's ark, which is usually found upon match-boxes. In America the tax was particularly easy to collect.

The following is the exact estimate of expenditure and revenue (as proposed by Mr. Lowe, including, of course, the new duties) for the current year 1871-2 :—

ESTIMATED EXPENDITURE.		ESTIMATED REVENUE.	
Interest of Debt . . .	£26,910,000	Customs	£20,100,000
Other Consolidated Fund		Excise	22,420,000
Charges	1,820,000	Stamps	9,600,000
Army (including abolition of		Taxes	2,330,000
Purchase)	16,452,000	Income-Tax	8,050,000
Navy	9,756,000	Post Office.	4,670,000
Civil Service	10,726,000	Telegraphs	750,000
Revenue Departments	5,076,000	Crown Lands	375,000
Packet Service	1,148,000	Miscellaneous	4,100,000
Telegraphs	420,000		
Total Expenditure	£72,308,000	Total Revenue	£72,395,000

Estimated surplus, 87,000*l.* The estimated revenue, without any

change in the taxation, would have only reached 69,595,000*l.*, with a deficit of 2,713,000*l.* Mr. Lowe estimated a decrease on almost every branch of the revenue, instead of the usual increase ;—professedly on the ground that the past year had been so exceptionally prosperous that we could not count on its continuance.

The financial statement was received with blank surprise. Whatever may have been the opinion of his colleagues, Mr. Lowe apparently believed that he had devised an ingenious and satisfactory Budget. His satisfaction was not shared by a single non-official supporter within or without the walls of Parliament. The Match-tax¹ was universally regarded as both a frivolous and a retrograde measure ; and a few days afterwards a squalid procession of match-makers from the East End of London to Westminster indicated a risk of popular discontent which it was not desirable to provoke for the sake of a trivial gain. The Government at once yielded either to general opinion or to the demands of the mob, and it was announced that the Match Duty would be struck out of the Budget. But Mr. Lowe and Mr. Gladstone were not warned by their first failure of the imprudence of disregarding the common sentiment of mankind and of offending all who had property to leave or to inherit. Before the resumption of the debate, an intimation was received from a large number of the supporters of Government that they would oppose the increase of the Succession-duty, and accordingly Mr. Gladstone was compelled to announce the withdrawal of the modified Budget, and he proposed in its place the addition of twopence in the pound to the Income-tax. Mr. Gladstone stated

¹ The curious in defunct Bills may study the provisions of the Match Tax Bill, which proposed to enact that from the 10th of May next no matches shall be sold, or be delivered out of the possession of any manufacturer or importer of matches, except under the following conditions :—1. The matches shall be contained in a box. 2. Each box of matches shall have affixed thereto a label or labels (which shall not have been before used) denoting the proper amount of duty payable upon such box according to the number and kind of matches therein contained. 3. Such label or labels shall be affixed so that the whole thereof shall adhere to the box, and so that the box cannot be opened without tearing or destroying the label or labels. 4. Where more than one label is affixed to any box of matches the labels shall be affixed so that every label shall be wholly or partially visible. The penalty for selling matches except under these conditions is fixed at 10*l.* ; for manufacturing them, 50*l.* Power is given to the police to arrest any person selling unlabelled matches, and the offender is liable to a month's hard labour, in default of paying 10*l.* penalty. The penalty for selling labels without authority is 20*l.*, and the proof that the labels have not been previously used will be upon the defendant. The penalty for buying labels which have been previously used is 100*l.* Manufacturers and importers of matches are to make entry of their premises intended to be used for manufacturing or storing matches. Matches are not to be imported in labelled boxes, but they may be exported duty free. The Commissioners of Inland Revenue will allow a discount of 1 per cent. to any person who shall purchase labels to the value of 50*l.* and upwards. The punishment for forging or counterfeiting labels is penal servitude for a period of from three years to life, or imprisonment not exceeding two years. The term "matches" is to include lucifer-matches, fuses, and all other matches prepared so as to be capable of being ignited by friction, or otherwise than by the application of actual fire or heat, manufactured in or imported into the United Kingdom ; and where any match has more than one point or part prepared as aforesaid, every such point or part shall be deemed to be, and shall be counted as, a separate match. The term "box," the Bill says, is to include every other kind of enclosure

in the gentlest possible way, that, as the addition was to be exactly twopence, of course the mode of computing the Income-tax by a percentage (which had been another change proposed by Mr. Lowe) would not be necessary, and would stand over "for an impartial expression of public opinion." The transparent veil thrown by Mr. Gladstone over these two last defeats roused inextinguishable laughter.

Mr. Disraeli followed him by a demand that the consideration of this completely transformed Budget, of which the leading feature was, as he remarked, "a sweet simplicity," should be postponed for a day or two. The new Budget proposed, he said, to raise the whole deficiency of the year, 2,700,000*l.*, by direct taxation. Last year the indirect taxation had been reduced by 3,000,000*l.* This year the direct was to be increased by nearly the same amount, making a *relative* difference of near 6,000,000*l.* between the indirect and direct taxation in two years. But this was not all. Usually it might be said that "sufficient for the year are the burdens thereof," but this was hardly true of a year in which the Ministers had directly stated that so many of their plans would involve either a further loss of a revenue or a further increase of revenue in the year beyond. Nearly 900,000*l.* of the miscellaneous revenue of this year could not be expected next year. A further sum of 600,000*l.* would be wanted next year, beyond what was wanted this year, for extinguishing purchase. Again, 1,200,000*l.* of house-duty was proposed to be surrendered next year to the local taxation. These sums made up together a further sum of 2,700,000*l.* of *extra* deficit for next year, so that the deficit of next year might reach 5,400,000*l.* How to meet this startling deficit Mr. Lowe had, of course, made no suggestion; but he had thrown out unpleasant hints—of withdrawing the exemption from "agricultural horses and carts"—a theme which would find employment, said Mr. Disraeli, for those Chambers of Agriculture which are sometimes taunted with having nothing to do. Then there was the suggestion that consanguinity ought to make no difference in the rate of legacy and Succession-duties—a hint odious to all the cherished ideas of English family life. Of course, time must be asked and taken to consider so very unpleasant a financial situation, pregnant with so many threats for the future.

Mr. Lowe replied briefly, disclaiming utterly the character of financial "hints" which had been attributed to his various expressions of private opinion; but conceding that a good deal of reference to "prospective" finance was, under the circumstances, justified. Then arose private members to congratulate or taunt the Government on having given way—Lord George Cavendish, fully conscious of wielding great Cavendish influence, and treating the Government like the "heavy father" of comedy, who has been justly offended, but is not implacable. He was much cheered as he took the Government once more to his bosom, and bade it not think of Succession-duties again. Then Mr. Fawcett, lofty and implac-

able, denounced the Government for falling from sin to sin, and by placing all the iniquitous amount of new taxation on the Income-tax, trying to teach the democracy the evil lesson that they could be extravagant without cost to themselves.

Mr. Osborne, who declared that it was his poverty and not his will that consented to his sitting among advanced Liberals and retrograde democrats—below the gangway—condoled with the Ministers upon the manner in which Lord George Cavendish had helped a lame dog over a stile; and, comparing Mr. Lowe to a Jonah who had been thrown overboard with all his sins—for he called the attention of the House to the fact that the right hon. gentleman had not repented of any of his offences—professed that he did not envy the fish who had to swallow him. He did not agree with Mr. Fawcett, whom he described as the “Tory democratic member for Brighton,” in his opinion of the new proposal; and asserted that the only way to secure the reduction of expenditure was to make the upper classes pay for the luxury of panics in which they chose to indulge.

In the discussion which followed, a dozen or so of members addressed the House, all expressing satisfaction at the course which had been adopted by the Government, and reflecting with more or less severity upon the original proposals of the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Towards the close of the debate, Mr. Auberon-Herbert rose to defend Mr. Fawcett against the attack made upon him by Mr. Osborne. While complimenting the member for Waterford upon his ability as a joker, and assuring him that if he were a giver of dinners he should always keep an empty chair for him—an intimation which drew from Mr. Osborne a very audible remark, “I don’t think I would come if I were asked,” followed by a loud laugh—he reminded him that politics were something more than an arena in which every man should fight for his own hand; and, referring to a remark made by the hon. gentleman that Mr. Fawcett was the only member in the House who was willing to wear the Phrygian cap, suggested, amid cries of “Oh, oh,” that the more appropriate head-dress for Mr. Osborne would be “the cap that makes music as it goes.”

On a later day, Mr. M’Cullagh Torrens was defeated only by a majority of fifty in a full House on a motion for limiting the increase of the Income-tax to a penny, and for providing the remainder by suspending the conversion of the debt. But for the natural and legitimate restrictions on the expression of individual opinion, Mr. Torrens’ proposal would have been carried by a large majority. A Ministerial party habitually supports the financial proposals of the Government, and, after the rejection of two successive Budgets, a third defeat would have compelled a resignation.

So the increased Income-tax was carried amidst a general and deep feeling of disapproval, nor was the scandalous injustice and crudeness of the scheme rendered less distasteful in consequence of the promulgation by some of Mr. Gladstone’s satellites of a theory

that the poorer classes have no interest in the independence of the country, and no moral liability to share in providing for its defence.

The administration of the Admiralty gave rise to many changes and difficulties during the session. Mr. Childers was forced, by the state of his health, to retire from the post of First Lord, and was succeeded by Mr. Goschen, Mr. Stansfeld becoming President of the Poor Law Board, with a seat in the Cabinet, and Mr. Baxter taking the office of Secretary of the Treasury. Mr. Winterbotham thereupon accepted the Under-Secretaryship for the Home Department in the place of Mr. Shaw-Lefevre, who went to the Secretaryship of the Admiralty to help Mr. Goschen. The appointment of the latter gentleman elicited at first much hostile criticism and even ridicule; but he soon proved himself well qualified for his post even by the general admission of his opponents, and effaced to some extent the memory of his Local Taxation Bill. Within a few days of his accession to his new office he introduced the Navy Estimates in a speech which proved that he had already made himself conversant with the details of his new duties; and on Easter Monday, in returning thanks for her Majesty's Ministers at the Lord Mayor's dinner, he distinguished himself by making a remarkable speech, terse, weighty, and couched in a peculiar tone of dignity and self-reliance. He expressed the regret of the Ministers that after two sessions and a half of hard work they had achieved so little. The truth was that the stupendous events happening abroad had arrested the attention of the Government and the country. "And what had we to do now?" he said. "We had to buy back our army, which belonged at this moment to the officers, and not to the nation." It would cost much, but the result would be adequate to the expense. He did not think the foreign policy of the Government had been "other than honourable" to the country. They had pursued a policy which had been called a policy of isolation, but which was at least one of unselfishness, and he believed there were many countries in Europe which would prefer "the disinterested neutrality of England to the sinister policy of some Continental States." England was never credited abroad with simple honesty in her foreign policy. Some Machiavellian design was always imputed to her. Europe would have it that we abolished the slave trade because we were jealous of the competition of the French and Spanish colonies, and that we sided with Denmark because we feared the result of the harbour of Kiel falling into German hands. But he held we were more single-minded in our foreign policy than any other nation, and thought Europe foolish to be taken in by our habit of self-depreciation. Public opinion in this country was like a good strong horse rather out of condition with being fed only on green meat. Recent events in Europe should teach us to rely not on treaties or alliances, which often fail when the pinch comes, not on the word of statesmen—for secret treaties shake confidence in that—but upon ourselves. We ought to take measure of ourselves, and, if necessary, to hold every man to his duty of maintaining the honour and

glory of England "at the same height at which it had been held through many generations."

Mr. Goschen found himself saddled with a duty not so agreeable in defending the conduct of his predecessor in a matter which had caused much discussion. Vice-Admiral Sir Spencer Robinson, Third Lord of the Admiralty, and one of the most distinguished officials connected with that department, had been dismissed from his post by the Premier in consequence of differences with Mr. Childers. A long correspondence, in which Sir Spencer Robinson, Mr. Childers, and Mr. Gladstone had among others taken part, was published in the newspapers, and did not reflect any high credit on the Ministers. One letter of Mr. Gladstone's, in which he took the extraordinary step of requesting Sir Spencer to alter the date of one of his letters for publication, was the source of much amusement to the public, especially to those interested in the complexities of the Premier's character. It seemed only too clear, on the whole, that Sir Spencer's dismissal was referable to the sad loss of the "Captain," of the peculiar mode of construction of which vessel, as of Captain Coles's system generally, which Mr. Childers had strongly advocated, Sir Spencer had as strongly expressed his disapproval. The matter led to a discussion in Parliament, which, but for the illness and absence of Mr. Childers, would probably have taken a much more severe turn. As it was, Mr. Bouverie gave expression to a very general feeling when he said that Sir Spencer Robinson had been treated "unjustly and ungenerously." It cannot indeed be said that justice and generosity were this year conspicuous in the measures and conduct of Mr. Gladstone's Government.

CHAPTER III.

The History of Purchase—Debates upon the Army Bill—Its altered form—Debate in the House of Lords—The Duke of Richmond's Motion—Speeches on the Motion—Majority against the Government—Abolition of Purchase by Royal Warrant—Effect of the Proceeding—Vote of Censure on the Ministry passed by the Lords—The Army Bill passed—Proceedings in the Commons—Letter of Sir Roundell Palmer—Article in the "Journal des Débats"—The Ballot Bill—Conservative Tactics—Meeting of Liberal Members—Their Policy—The Bill thrown out by the Lords—University Tests Bill—Mr. Fawcett's Bill relating to Trinity College, Dublin—The "Megæra"—Epping Forest and the Thames Embankment—Deceased Wife's Sister's Bill—Female Suffrage—Mr. Miall's motion for the Disestablishment of the English Church—Mr. Bruce's Blunders—The Washington Treaty—History of its Discussion—The Berkshire Campaign and its Abandonment—Privy Council Bill—Elections for East Surrey and Plymouth.

IN the year 1683, a Royal Warrant was issued ordering the payment of 1s. in the pound on the surrender of a commission to the person surrendering, and by him to whom the surrender is made. Ten years subsequently, William III., by a warrant, interdicted the payment "of any present or gratuity" for obtaining a commission, every officer being obliged to take oath that he had

neither directly nor indirectly given any money to any one for his commission. The oath was omitted in the Mutiny Act of 1701, and in the following year purchase was legally recognized by the decision in the case of *Ive v. Ash*, where a lieutenant who had repudiated his engagement to pay 600*l.* for a company was bound to perform it, the Court of Chancery overruling the plea that the transaction was a fraudulent one. In 1711 Queen Anne issued a warrant interdicting the sale of commissions without the royal approbation under the sign manual, and in no case under twenty years' service, or unless the intending vendor were disabled while serving. In 1719-20 some important regulations were issued limiting the sale of commissions to military purchasers; in 1725 a commission was appointed to inquire into the practice of over-regulation payments; in 1765 another commission was appointed under Lord Ligonier with the same object. One result of this commission was a fixed scale of prices, by which it appears that an ensigncy cost 400*l.*, and the command of a regiment 3500*l.*

Large over-regulation sums, however, continued to be paid, a practice which was rendered penal by an Act passed in 1798, the interference of all persons with the sale of commissions save authorized army agents being at the same time interdicted. In 1833 the Duke of Wellington addressed a famous Memorandum to a Committee on Army and Navy Appointments, in which he extolled the Purchase System. In 1840 the Report of Lord Melbourne's Commissions was issued, bearing the signatures of the most eminent soldiers of the day. This Report dwelt upon the advantages of the Purchase System as furthering promotion and retirement, and thereby securing physical efficiency among officers. In 1850 the Report of a Committee on Army and Ordnance Expenditure contained the approval of purchase by the Duke of Wellington, Lord Raglan, and Lord Panmure. Further commissions were appointed in 1854 and 1856, the Report of the latter recommending the cessation of the sale of commissions at the rank of lieutenant-colonel. Among the witnesses examined by this commission were "Jacob Omnium" and Sir Charles Trevelyan. During the following years various commissions were appointed for the consideration of such questions as promotion in the higher ranks (1858), distinguished service colonels (1863), retirement (1867), supersession of colonels (1870), promotion and retirement in the ordnance corps (1870), and over-regulation prices (1870).

Such briefly is the history of the Purchase System in the British Army, an anomaly which it was clearly impossible to maintain after the Government of the day had declared that its abolition was necessary, and when the House of Commons was prepared to deal justly and liberally with the private interests which were affected. For Parliament was invited to compensate officers, not only for the legal value of their commissions, but for the excess of prices beyond the regulated amount which they had paid in accordance with the usage of the service. Mr. Cardwell may, perhaps, have fallen into

some exaggeration when he asserted that reforms in the Army were impeded at every turn by the direct or indirect operation of Purchase. Many military authorities approved the practice, on the ground, or on the pretext, that it tended to accelerate promotion among regimental officers; and some political theorists regarded with complacent toleration a custom which secured the predominant influence of civil and social opinion in the Army. But as Lord Derby observed during the debate in the House of Lords, no institution is tenable in England which cannot be defended by arguments intelligible to the mass of the constituency. When purchase became the subject of discussion, no authority could dispel the popular belief that promotion obtained by the payment of money involved an undue and corrupt advantage to the rich. A Royal Commission had recently reported that the practice of bargaining for commissions was inseparable from the permission to buy them; and there was, perhaps, a certain scandal in the notorious frequency of transactions which were still prohibited by law. The strongest obstacle to the proposed abolition was the necessity of spending several millions for a purpose which tended but indirectly to promote the efficiency of the Army, and which had no bearing on its numerical strength; yet it was certain that purchase was destined to extinction sooner or later, and some deference was due to the judgment of the Government that the proper time had arrived. Mr. Cardwell, in his opening speech, had given no undue prominence to the part of his Bill which provided for the abolition of Purchase; but the discussion which occupied the greater part of the Session was almost exclusively confined to the expediency of the change. Lord Elcho alone raised the serious question of compulsory Ballot for the Militia, but the sense of the House was clearly against his proposal. From that time, in concert with Colonel Anson, Colonel Loyd-Lindsay, and other zealous opponents of the Bill, Lord Elcho with persistent iteration discussed the question of Purchase on every clause and at every stage of the Bill. An amendment against the abolition of Purchase, moved by Colonel Loyd-Lindsay, was, after a long debate, withdrawn by the advice of Mr. Disraeli. The discussion of the clauses continued night after night, as if for the purpose of excusing the Government for its failures in general legislation. So obstinate was the resistance of the military members, that even Sir Roundell Palmer, no friend to radical measures, rose in the House to rebuke them. "A course," he said, "had been taken the like of which he never remembered. Other great measures affecting great interests had been opposed without the minority endeavouring to baffle the majority by mere consumption of time. The minority who resisted the Irish Church and Land Bills had recognized the duty of respecting the principle of Parliamentary government, that the decision of the majority shall be binding. Conduct like that was neither in the interest of the country, of the Army, nor of Conservative principle."

To a limited extent, the Opposition tactics, thoroughly dis-

creditable as in the opinion of the best Conservatives they were, proved successful. In the second week of June, after four months of discussion which had done, after the first formal debate, nothing to illustrate the subject in dispute, Mr. Cardwell informed the House that in consequence of the opposition to the Bill, which, as Mr. Gladstone subsequently said, threatened to "make legislation physically impossible," the Government would only insist on the Purchase clauses, and the transfer of power over the Militia and Volunteers from the Lords-Lieutenant to the Crown. The first object of the Bill was the reconveyance of the Army from the officers to the nation. Thereupon Mr. Disraeli sprang up to say that he had not approved the abolition of Purchase for itself, but as a means towards the reorganization of the Army now abandoned, that Government had acted with singular disingenuousness, and that the Bill should be withdrawn. Mr. Gladstone replied that the abolition of Purchase had always been the leading feature of the Bill, that the opposition deserved an epithet he would not apply to it, and that the Government must, and would, clear the ground for reorganization, by abolishing Purchase and the privilege of the Lords-Lieutenant.

It was believed at first that the Colonels would continue their opposition, but a strong hint from Mr. Cardwell that he could stop the payment of extra-regulation money by putting the law in force had its effect, and the Bill escaped through Committee. In its novel form it abolished Purchase, and depriving Lords-Lieutenant of their anomalous power of appointing officers in the Militia, restored to the State the government of the Army, while also enabling Parliament to fix from year to year the number of the Militia, authorizing Government to insist on six months' continuous training as the condition of entering that force, and making Volunteers when under training in the camps subject to the Mutiny Act.

About the probable action of the House of Lords much doubt was entertained up to the moment when the Bill was sent up to them, and even after their first day of debate. It was reasonably hoped that the Peers would defer to the opinion of the House of Commons, and that they would, even against their own judgment, close a controversy which admitted of only one final solution. It was resolved at a meeting of Conservative peers, held at the Carlton on the morning before the debate, to reject the Bill; but only eighty of the Lords were present, and it was known that Lord Derby for one dissented from the resolution.

Lord Northbrook opened the debate with a clear exposition of the policy of the Government, denying absolutely that they were, as had been freely charged against them, without a plan. Their plan, he said, was to introduce the Prussian system into this country without compulsory service, by dividing the total forces of the country into districts, linking together Army, Militia, and Volunteers, giving the Militia a first training of three months,

allowing officers to transfer themselves from one service to another, raising the Artillery until it was sufficient for an army of 150,000 men, and educating all officers employed. He showed by exhaustive illustrations that none of these things could be accomplished until Purchase had been abolished, and the Crown reinvested with the right of selecting officers for the Militia, and concluded by an emphatic declaration that all he had said had been said at the very beginning by the Secretary of State for War, and that no portion of the Bill essential to the Government plan had been dropped in the other House.

The Conservative attack took the shape of a motion by the Duke of Richmond that the House should not pass the second reading until it had before it a comprehensive plan. He admitted that Lord Northbrook had described a large scheme, but refused to consider it because it contained a mass of details which would have to be considered first. He declared that no reorganization could be found within the four corners of the Bill; defended Purchase, not in theory, but in practice, as a cheap scheme of retirement, securing a rapid flow of promotion; argued that the officers were very good; complained of the unknown expenditure with which the Government intended to saddle the country; and thought that every thing good in the new scheme could be obtained without abolishing Purchase. In short, he made a Purchase speech, and was supported by Lord Dalhousie, who described the abolition of Purchase as another "leap in the dark," and predicted that the Army would become political. Earl Grey argued on the same side, professing, however, not to defend Purchase, but only to attack the alternative systems of selection and seniority. His main point, however, was that the Regulars should be increased and the Militia abandoned; while the Marquis of Hertford, who followed him, defended Purchase absolutely, as being approved by the forty men who in his own regiment in his own lifetime had risen from privates to be officers.

The only independent speech in defence of Government made during the first day's debate was by Lord Sandhurst, who spoke heartily and even warmly in favour of abolition. Promotion, he said, did depend on money, and he did not believe that the moral influence of a commanding officer could be maintained over a thousand men while they knew that command was being put up to auction, and they sold like a flock of sheep. Purchase arose in the days of the Stuarts, and was part of the corruption of their time. He denied the alleged difficulty of administering selection, asserting that he had tried it in large armies, and was not more troubled by solicitations than the Duke of Cambridge was under the present scheme. He believed that the social feeling of regiments, which was so valuable, would survive Purchase, and held that the prophecies of enormous outlay on retirements were unfounded. Upon Colonel Anson's own figures, the amount could not exceed 250,000*l.* per annum. He concluded a very powerful speech by declaring

that we had now 500,000 men under arms, and needed nothing but the organization which, if Purchase were but abolished, the Government had promised.

The Peers rose above the Commons in the width of the considerations they expressed, and the same high tone was preserved throughout the debate. The form of the motion enabled the Lords to avoid a direct vote in favour of Purchase, but the speeches of the majority all showed that their wish was to protect that mode of promotion.

The Duke of Rutland's point, for example, was that purchase and professional education were quite compatible things; Lord Hardinge held that purchase secured "a rapid flow of promotion;" Lord Vivian believed that better officers could not be found in Europe than those of the British army; the Duke of Beaufort thought the feeling of officers was against abolition; Viscount Melville could not see how Purchase interfered with the effectiveness of our forces; the Duke of Manchester believed that if properly carried out Purchase would do no harm; Lord Carnarvon, though in theory condemning Purchase, stated that in practice it had prevented the conversion of the officers into a separate caste, that they had hitherto been English gentlemen, rather than professional men with professional politics: Lord Abinger frankly avowed that he was opposed to change because officers liked the system: Lord Lucan thought it his duty as a soldier to uphold Purchase as long as he could; the Duke of Northumberland objected to every other system of promotion; Lord Stratford de Redcliffe thought high professional opinion was in favour of Purchase; Earl Brownlow said selection dissatisfied the Navy; and Lord Strathnairn utterly condemned the stagnation of promotion caused by every system except Purchase. Lord Derby, alone of Tory peers of consequence, took a different line. He disposed of the question of expense in a sentence, by saying that unless the Army were reduced, the expense of abolishing Purchase would be as oppressive years hence as now, and might be even increased. As to delay, where was the dignity of delaying an inevitable reform, inevitable because no institution could now stand which did not admit of defence before a partially educated electorate? If you asked twenty people in the street about Purchase, ten would not know what you meant, and ten would suppose that Government kept a shop for the sale of commissions. It was fair to say Government was now pledged to pay over-regulation prices, but who had pledged that final and very different tribunal, the electorate? The Army had been offered fair terms, and on the experience of many years he urged the Peers to accept them, more especially as he had high legal authority for saying their consent was not required, and Purchase could be abolished by Warrant from the Crown.

The Duke of Argyll quite appreciated the sub-tone of the debate, the dread entertained by the House of abolishing Purchase, and made in reply a very able speech. Without exaggerating, he

showed that the existing system of promotion was one of seniority qualified by money; that, although not irrespective of merit, it was irrespective of comparative merit; that it prohibited rejection, except in extreme cases of bad temper or bad military character, (there had been no case of veto for five years); that the system made the Army one vast web of pecuniary interests nearly impossible to reach; that Colonels of distinguished capacity could not be selected; that the system prohibited the best method of increasing the Army, that of doubling the battalions; that, in short, it was fatal to the very demand made by the House for a thorough scheme of reorganization.

Lord Salisbury closed the attack upon the Bill in a speech of singular acrimony. He declined to discuss the question upon the sole ground of the interest of the British officer. Dismissing with contempt the allegation that if their lordships adopted this amendment the next Bill might not provide for the payment of over-regulation payments, he pointedly alluded to Lord Derby's description of the constituencies, as indicating that he was not quite satisfied with his own work in the late Reform Bill. If the constituencies were so bad as to refuse to sanction the terms of the Government, then "God help the public creditor, for he will be the first person to suffer from this desire of the constituencies to spoliage the rich on the first plausible pretext." He declared that, whatever statements had been made to the contrary notwithstanding, the officers of the Army were opposed to this Bill, and were anxious that it should not pass. It was possible that if we were all thrown upon a desert island, purchase might not be set up as an institution, and he was not quite sure the Duke of Argyll himself would be an institution that would be set up under such circumstances. Denying that Purchase was the issue upon which they were going into the lobby, he said that Purchase did provide a system of retirement, and that he and those about him had a right to ask how those objects were to be accomplished if it were abolished. Passing in caustic review the relations between the Ministerial leaders and their followers in the other House, he hinted at the improbability that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would go on throwing away 1,000,000*l.* a year on military retirement. Party influence was the blot of the political system of the United States, and this was also the great danger of our political future. If Purchase had been described as a system of seniority tempered by selection, the more correct formula of the proposed system was stagnation tempered by jobbery. It was the especial duty of that House to protect the country against rash and imperfect legislation, and he exhorted their lordships not to abandon the Army to the influence of combined senility and corruption. The Bill was urged forward by the Prime Minister to redeem the barrenness of a useless session, but their lordships, by adopting the amendment, would confirm their title to the affection and esteem of the country.

Lord Granville regarded the speech just delivered as illustrating how far one of the ablest Members of their lordships' House could

push sarcasm and invective. Replying generally upon the whole debate, he stated authoritatively that, although the Government would not be unmindful of economy, the War Office would with all speed apply itself to enforce the plan laid before the House and the country in this debate. If the Government desired a mere party triumph they could not wish for a more favourable state of things than to appear to be engaged in a struggle, in which they were certain to be victorious, to prevent the removal of an abuse which was supposed to be connected with the class interest of that House. But, owing as he did more than, perhaps, any one else to their lordships' House, he besought them to pause, and to remember the position held by that House during the Conservative leadership of the late Duke of Wellington and Lord Derby respectively. The policy of the Duke was to avoid collision as much as possible with the other House, while all the victories won under the late Lord Derby were sterile, and the present division would certainly come under this category.

The division which followed gave a majority of twenty-five against Government—155 to 130,—but it was stated that among "the Peers of the realm" Government gained a positive majority of one (146 to 145, including pairs), and were defeated only by the representative Scotch and Irish Peers, who, having been virtually nominated by the Tory leaders, were almost unanimous in their opposition,—29 of them voting for the Duke of Richmond, and only 3 for Government, these numbers also of course including pairs.

If nothing further had occurred this vote would have been equivalent to the rejection of the Bill; but the disapprobation with which thoughtful and dispassionate politicians regarded the decision of the House of Lords was immediately afterwards diverted to another object. A serious collision between the two Houses was feared, but few had anticipated any thing so grave and startling as was in reality to occur. When the Commons met, on the second day after the adverse vote, the Prime Minister made the surprising announcement that Purchase was already abolished by a Royal Warrant, which her Majesty had been advised to sign. The announcement was made in answer to Sir George Grey, who asked whether the violation of the law in the payment of over-regulation prices was to be prohibited, and, after narrating what had happened in the Lords, Mr. Gladstone pointed out that it did not amount to a rejection of the Bill, but simply to a postponement of the second reading until certain information had been laid before them, and that it was open to any peer to move the second reading. Next he reminded the House that by statute there was no Purchase but what was permitted by the Queen's Regulations, but that the intervention of the House would be required to find a pecuniary indemnity for the officers affected. Though the Government would never have thought it reasonably within their competence to take any vital step without consulting the House, having now got its

definite judgment against Purchase, and having before them the declaration of the Royal Commission, that over-regulation could not be got rid of except by abolishing Purchase altogether, the Government had advised her Majesty to cancel the Warrant under which Purchase is legal. This advice her Majesty had been graciously pleased to accept—a new warrant had been framed—and therefore, said Mr. Gladstone, amid loud cheering, “after November 1 next Purchase will cease to exist.” After defending this resolution as consistent with constitutional usage, and best calculated to put an end to a state of suspense dangerous to the discipline of the Army, he went on to comment on what the House of Lords might be expected to do in the altered state of circumstances. In the hope that they would be disposed to go on with the remaining (compensation) clauses, a sufficient time for consideration would be allowed, but he declined, at present, to say what the Government would do if they failed to prosecute the Bill to its legitimate end. He closed his speech with this remark: “But one thing I must state on the part of the Government, and that is, that come what may, under all circumstances, we shall use the best means in our power, mindful of the honourable pledges we have given, to secure the ends which Parliament has had in view, and just and liberal terms for the officers.”

Lord Granville made a similar statement in the House of Lords; and both he and Mr. Gladstone were careful to explain that the Queen had acted, not in the exercise of Prerogative, but in virtue of a statutory power conferred by an Act of George III. Affecting to adopt the view which the Opposition had for the most part professed to take, that the Bill did not turn on the maintenance or abolition of Purchase, Lord Granville begged the Lords to co-operate with the Ministry in doing justice to the officers, “under the altered circumstances,” when dealing with the compensation-clauses.

The announcement of the Ministerial policy created great and general excitement. Mr. Disraeli denounced it in the Commons as “part of an avowed and shameful conspiracy against the undoubted privileges of the other House of Parliament,” words which he recalled on a hint from the Speaker, but which supplied his party with a good rallying cry. Not only the Conservative, but the leading Liberal journals expressed utter disapproval of the Warrant. The country, however, failed to take any great interest in the matter, notwithstanding the gravity of the step now taken by the House of Lords—which would have been graver if immediate.

Lord Northbrook having laid on the table the Royal Warrant for the abolition of Purchase, the Duke of Richmond appealed to the Government to fix the second reading for Monday, July 31, and gave notice that, on the motion that the Bill be read a second time, he should move to add the following words:—“That this House, in assenting to the second reading of this Bill, desires to express its opinion that the interposition of the Executive, during the progress

of a measure submitted to Parliament by her Majesty's Government, in order to attain by the exercise of the prerogative, and without the aid of Parliament, the principal object included in that measure, is calculated to depreciate and neutralize the independent action of the Legislature, and is strongly to be condemned; and this House assents to the second reading of this Bill only in order to secure the officers of her Majesty's army compensation to which they are entitled consequent on the abolition of Purchase in the army." In other words, the Lords resolved to pass a vote of censure on the Ministry, but deferred it until after the Goodwood races. The debate on the subject, however, when it took place, was worthy of the subject and of the occasion, considered as an exhibition of oratory.

The Duke of Richmond said that the abolition of Purchase by Royal Warrant, when their Lordships had not refused to pass the second reading of the Army Bill, but had only asked for further information, was an event which, for importance, could scarcely be paralleled in our parliamentary history, and which imposed upon their Lordships a corresponding responsibility to maintain the honour and dignity of that House. Declining altogether to enter upon the merits of the Army Bill, he recapitulated the parliamentary proceedings in regard to that measure, and briefly sketched the joint action of the Executive and the Legislature in regard to army purchase from its commencement. Under such circumstances the Crown ought not to have been advised to exercise the Royal Prerogative without reference to any Act of Parliament. If the Crown were advised that it was acting under statute, as had been asserted by Lord Granville on the evening the warrant was signed, it had been improperly advised, and her Majesty's signature had been improperly obtained. Although it was in the power of the Crown to set up the network of vested interests created by Army Purchase, he maintained that the Crown could not alone, *ex mero motu*, get rid of them, and that it was a distinct interference with the legislative functions of their Lordships to take the matter out of their hands while the Bill was still before them. Was that House a deliberative assembly or not, or was its opinion only to be taken when it coincided with that of the Government? He asked their Lordships to enter a protest as strong and as decorous as Parliamentary usage allowed against a course which threatened to render all discussion liable to be arrested by the "*sic volo, sic jubeo*" of an imperious Minister.

Lord Granville, after a pleasant reference to the brightest gems of the Duke's speech, which he declared to be his quotations from three of the speeches of his colleagues at the Mansion House, examined the alternatives before the Government, and declared that the only course open to them was to deal with Army Purchase by the Royal Prerogative. The Government were asked why, if they had this power, they did not exercise it six months ago; but would it have been wise to abolish Purchase before obtaining the assent of the House of Commons? Feeling that the effect of the

resolution agreed to upon the second reading was to paralyze Purchase in the Army, to disorganize its discipline, and prevent the measures necessary for the amalgamation of the line and the reserved forces, the Government did not shrink from the responsibility of a course which was, after all, strictly legal and constitutional. After criticizing the changes made in the form and substance of the resolution now before the House, he adduced various precedents to show that Purchase had been regulated and abolished by the authority of the Crown. Again reminding their Lordships of the course taken by the late Duke of Wellington, in abstaining from bringing the differences between the two Houses into prominence, but speaking against all hope that similar wisdom would be shown that night, he impressively pointed out the consequences of the resolution and its effect upon the public out of doors.

Lord Salisbury accused the Government of having committed a grave breach of constitutional usage in having brought Army Purchase within Parliamentary jurisdiction, and in having afterwards snapped their fingers in their Lordships' faces when they were outvoted. Examining and declaring to be insufficient the pretexts by which the conduct of the Government had been justified in calling up a dormant Royal Prerogative, he expressed a belief that, up to the rejection of the Army Bill, the Government had not determined to issue the Royal Warrant, but that in so doing they were actuated by passion and resentment. Lord Granville having given point to this charge by a Parliamentary cheer, Lord Salisbury retorted that Lord Granville had been made the most reluctant instrument of insulting the order to which he belonged, but that their Lordships knew the dictator under whom he served. After a scathing analysis of the majority of the Government in the Lower House, which he asserted was led by its extreme section, he argued that, under such circumstances, the functions of their Lordships rose into peculiar prominence, and that it was their duty to remit to the decision of the constituencies measures passed under pressure of this kind. When their Lordships were told that it was their duty always to agree with the other House, he asked whether it was worth while to retain their power by uniformly acting against their convictions. They complained of a great constitutional wrong and a misuse by an imperious Ministry of the Prerogative of the Crown. The resolution was no unpractical proceeding because it might not be followed by the resignation of the Ministry, and he described the motion as an invitation to the public to join them in condemning an act which was a menace to the independence of Parliament and an insult to the acknowledged and never misused authority of the House of Lords.

The Duke of Argyll, who characterized the speech just delivered as one of the bitterest and narrowest party-speeches he had ever heard, defended the conduct of the Government against the unconstitutional and unreasonable vote to which that House came on the Army Bill.

Lord Carnarvon claimed for the majority of their Lordships great moderation in having averted many painful collisions with the other House. The Radical section of the other House clamoured for the suppression of that House whenever their Lordships differed from them, but their Lordship's House always had been free, and when it ceased to be so it ought no longer to exist.

Lord Romilly stated the reasons which induced him, with considerable pain, to join the Opposition peers in protesting against the violent and offensive mode in which the Government had called upon their Lordships to eat their own words. He expressed considerable doubts as to the legality of the Royal Warrant, and inquired whether the opinion of the law officers of the Crown had been taken before it was issued.

Lord Penzance believed that the proper law officers had been consulted, and that, if the opinion of Westminster Hall were taken, it would be found that the act of the Government was perfectly legal and a proper exercise of legal powers.

Lord Derby, as his speech on the Army Bill had been quoted in justification of the abolition of Purchase by the Royal Warrant, said there was a wide difference between pointing out that a certain course was possible and recommending that it should be taken. After criticizing unfavourably the course taken by the Government, he finally condemned it as bad in a constitutional point of view and worse as a precedent; and, regretting that the Government, by adopting it, had injured a good cause, he heartily joined in the vote of censure. The resolution might not produce a political change, but it would place on record their opinion that astuteness was not statesmanship, and that smart practice did not pay in the long run.

The Duke of Somerset thought that the Government had acted wisely in taking this question out of the hands of agitators and public meetings. It might have been better if a little more time had been taken in issuing the Warrant, but purchase must go, and no other course than that which they adopted was really open to the Government.

Lord Russell, after an historical retrospect of the Acts regulating Purchase, reaffirmed his opinion on the expediency of abolishing Purchase, but justified his vote on the Army Bill in the absence of any plan of army reorganization. Their Lordships would also be perfectly justified in visiting with their condemnation the undue interposition of the Royal Prerogative, and a course of proceeding which tended to the gravest and most mischievous consequences.

Lord Cairns insisted on the unprecedented nature of the course taken by the Government, and entered upon a legal argument to show that the Royal Warrant was not issued in the exercise of a statutory right. Describing prerogative as a power not conferred by statute, he reminded their Lordships that both the Premier and Lord Granville assured Parliament that the Warrant was not an act of the prerogative, but a statutory right, and it was clear that the advice given to the Sovereign was that she was not making

use of her prerogative in issuing the Warrant. The Government, therefore, stood convicted on their own confession of having through ignorance misrepresented to the Sovereign the character of the act she was performing, which, instead of being a statutory act, was, in fact, an act of the highest and most stringent prerogative. The time, was past for prerogative, as such, to overthrow the net of vested interests sanctioned by statute. The Government had advised the Crown to break faith with the officers of the Army, and had seriously undermined the dignity and independence of their Lordships' House, and yet had not abolished Purchase after all, but only produced a temporary suspension of it. Admitting that he disliked the theory of Purchase, and that he should be very glad to get rid of it, he nevertheless first wanted to know what was to do its particular work. If the abolition of Purchase had been referred beforehand to the Liberal party in the House of Commons, they would not have consented to see it accomplished by an act of the prerogative, but would have preferred that it should be decided by our Parliamentary system. If discreditable scenes had, as the Duke of Argyll stated, been witnessed in the other House, perhaps the manner in which that House was led had something to do with it. However this might be, he objected to their Lordships being made the victims of a *coup d'état* for any such reason. Remarking upon the singular coincidence that the Royal Warrant was taken for her Majesty's signature by a nobleman bearing the title and herein following in the footsteps of the Viscount Halifax who issued General Warrants, he concluded a powerful peroration by saying that the Government would get their Bill, but would take with it the censure and condemnation of the House, deliberately approved by the country, for having, at a crisis that demanded the wisdom and forbearance of statesmen, acted with the petulance and recklessness of children. They had obtained an unreal triumph, but they had strained and discredited the Constitution of the country.

The Lord Chancellor denied that the Government had been convicted, either on their own confession or otherwise, of having given advice to the Sovereign which had been unwarranted by the facts. He explained that which was really conveyed to the royal ear, and, replying in some detail to the legal arguments urged by Lord Cairns, came to the vote of censure, which, he said, was as little justified as any vote to be found in their journals. Quoting words used by the Duke of Richmond in a different sense, he said that defeat was more glorious to the vanquished in such a cause than triumph to the victors could possibly be.

The vote of censure was carried in a House of 244 (not much more than half the number of Peers, notwithstanding the gravity of the occasion) by a majority of 80. The Bill itself was then passed without a division, and from that time the full responsibility for the organization and management of the Army was vested in the Government of the day. In the House of Commons, however, the unconstitutional proceeding of the Government was not allowed

to pass without protest. When the Bill was returned from the House of Lords, Mr. Disraeli called attention to the entire alteration of the preamble, and Mr. M'Cullagh Torrens, in an elaborate historical argument, challenged the right of the Crown to confiscate by prerogative the property of the subject. An unfortunate difference of opinion between the law advisers of the Crown did not improve the position of the Government. The Solicitor-General (Sir J. Coleridge) committed himself to a rash and sweeping declaration, that the control of the Army was absolutely vested in the Crown, and disavowed the plea of a statutory power which Lord Granville and Mr. Gladstone had put forward. The Attorney-General (Sir R. Collier) in his turn disavowed his colleague, and recurred to the original ground of argument, whereupon Mr. Harcourt, amid much laughter, asked the Government, in Newmarket phrase, to declare which horse they meant to win with—the Attorney-General on “Statute,” or the Solicitor-General on “Prerogative”? After complaining that no responsible Minister had spoken, he sharply assailed the Solicitor-General’s doctrine, that the Crown alone had authority over the Army. The direct reverse was nearer the truth, as he showed in an elaborate historical review of the relations of Parliament and the Army from the time of the Stuarts, quoting Mackintosh and Burke, and maintaining that the Army is the creation and the creature of Parliament, and that the Crown is the Parliamentary agent for governing the Army. Next, he commented on the silence of the Opposition, whom he compared to the Philistines delighting in the sight of the ministerial Samson toying with the Delilah of Prerogative. The issue of the Warrant Mr. Harcourt cordially supported, because he conceived it to be founded on a statutory power given by the Act of 1809, and he agreed with the Attorney-General in describing it as a simple withdrawal of the exemption from the penalties of the Act which the purchasers of commissions had hitherto enjoyed. It was the statute, not the Royal Warrant, which would make purchase illegal. Nevertheless he could not explain why the procedure by Warrant had not been taken from the beginning. It was one of those unintelligible processes of management in which this session had been so fertile. On the same evening, Mr. Fawcett delivered a powerful speech against the resort to Prerogative, pointing an impressive warning by reference to the use which might be made of it by a ministry bidding, for instance, for Ultramontane support in the matter of Irish education, or on such a question as the preservation of open spaces; while he professed his extreme surprise at the Radical sanction given to a step which enabled the Executive to snap its fingers in the face of a parliamentary minority, and to destroy every guarantee for parliamentary independence and liberty. Much as he objected to an hereditary Legislature, he disapproved still more strongly defeating the other House by a weapon which this House would dislike to have applied to itself; and further than this, if the House of Commons were to continue on its present footing

of merely representing the majority, and not the entire community, he should prefer to see the influence of the Second Chamber widened. From this Mr. Fawcett diverged into an elaborate plan for the reconstitution of the House of Lords, by giving senatorial rights to eminent public servants in the military, legal, colonial, Indian, and other services. On this occasion he sympathized with the unwillingness of the Lords to proceed until they were satisfied that political patronage—which was infinitely worse than purchase—was not to be introduced into the administration of the Army. If this act had been done by a Tory Ministry, it would have been passionately denounced by Mr. Gladstone amid the applause of the whole Liberal party.

Mr. Gladstone commenced by some sarcastic observations on the wide flights of Mr. Harcourt and Mr. Fawcett, and pointed out to them that to have proceeded by Warrant at first would have assumed that the House of Commons of its own authority could compensate persons who had habitually broken the law. Reverting to the speech of Mr. Disraeli, he admitted that it was difficult to reply to his argument, that the consideration for which the House had agreed to pay a large sum of money had disappeared from the Bill, and that Purchase might be revived as it had been abolished. But that, he pointed out, was the doing of the House of Lords; and he was content to trust to the vigilance of this House to prevent any such act. To Mr. Disraeli's challenge, to say whether he had advised the Crown to issue the Warrant on statute or by prerogative, he replied that he had advised her Majesty that she was in possession of a legal power, and that an adequate necessity existed for exercising it. From 1809 there had been a statutory power in existence authorizing the Queen to permit a certain thing which she now had declined to permit. There was a precedent for proceeding by prerogative after appealing to Parliament in 1840, in a proceeding relating to Coolie emigration. Of course it was a grave proceeding, but the great justification was the impossibility of otherwise putting a stop to the flagrant and crying evil of over-regulation prices. This Mr. Gladstone repeated several times, and concluded by saying that, though he did not undervalue the censure of the Lords, he appealed to the public opinion of the country for his justification.

The opponents of the Government commented significantly on the absence throughout the debate of the great Liberal lawyer, Sir Roundell Palmer, to whom a personal compliment was consequently paid, probably without precedent in Parliamentary history. Just before the prorogation, indeed while Black Rod was waiting to give his historic three taps, Mr. Cardwell read to the House of Commons a letter from Sir Roundell Palmer, denying that he objected to the issue of the Royal Warrant. He had always said that the issue of such a Warrant was within the undoubted power of the Crown, though it would not have been just to use it until a "sufficient assurance" had been obtained that Parliament would provide

compensation. All such powers are vested in the Crown in the confidence that right, and not wrong, will be done. When that assurance had been obtained—it being impossible that the Lords should exercise their power merely to prevent compensation—then, seeing that Purchase could not be maintained, and that delay in putting an end to it would be injurious to the Army and unjust to officers who might want to sell during the period of transition, Sir Roundell thought the issue of the Warrant “the least objectionable course” the Government could pursue.

Thus was accomplished one of the most remarkable changes of modern times, though one of which no contemporary can estimate the result or the real importance. The violent method of the change, and the indifference with which, in comparison with the possible importance of that method, it was received by the country, caused in some minds a great feeling of uneasiness. As a last word upon this subject, we may refer to an article by M. Eugène Dufeuille, which appeared in the *Journal des Débats*, and contained a clear summary of the case, and a clear intimation of thoughtful foreign opinions. After explaining to his readers the course that had been taken, he writes, “It may be easily imagined that this mode of putting an end to difficulties and of silencing the voice of the Lords has not given satisfaction to every body in England. Mr. Gladstone was accused of having violated the Constitution, and the words ‘*coup d’état*’ were even made use of in the House of Commons with reference to what had been done. The Ministry which for several days had considered the question as one the Lords were competent to deal with, as had been shown by submitting it to their examination, declared that its conduct was in conformity with the pure principles of the Constitution, and that the Warrant of the Queen was justified by similar Royal Warrants issued in the reign of Edward VI. and George III. These two Princes, however, can scarcely be referred to as perfect models of what Constitutional kings should be, and we cannot admit as incontestable the incompetence of the House of Lords to deal with matters of military administration, and the right of the Crown to dispense with the advice of Parliament in such questions. Mr. Bouverie seems to be nearer to the truth of history and Constitutional Government when, in this case at least, he makes the two Houses advance simultaneously; when he attributes to them the same rights and powers with regard to military administration; and when, lastly, he declares the intervention of the Crown under the recent circumstances to be little in conformity with the usages of a Liberal Government. If, in fact, as the Duke of Cambridge has asserted, the consent of the Minister of War is necessary with regard to all important measures connected with the Army, is it not clear that this Minister, who is alone responsible for the acts of the Sovereign, is placed, like his colleagues in the Cabinet, under the powers of Parliament, and that the Upper House has consequently the right of judging his conduct?

“There spring from this affair two charges against Mr. Gladstone; first, a want of knowledge and a want of respect for the Upper House, if he submitted without consideration to the opinion of the Lords a question with which they were not competent to deal; and, second, a violation of the Constitution if, as we are inclined to think, he has withdrawn from the authority of the Lords a question on which they were entitled to decide.”

In consequence of the prolonged debates on the Army Bill, it was found impossible to proceed with the Ballot Bill until late in June. When it was proceeded with, it was under conditions which produced a new form of conflict between the Ministry on the one hand, and the Opposition on the other. After five and thirty years of opposition to the principle of secret voting, Mr. Gladstone stood forward as a sudden convert, and ostentatiously and imperiously declared that the Bill must and should pass the Commons before the Session was concluded. It cannot be maintained that there was any pressing demand for the measure in the country, or that it was desirable for other than party purposes. The Liberals had been seriously disunited by the failures and divisions of the Session, and the Minister saw in this measure a means to reunite them. Some Conservatives, on their side, met the emergency by taking advantage of the forms of the House, and by talking against time on every possible occasion, and night after night endeavoured to burke the Bill. Up to the time of the Bill going into Committee, it had appeared to please the Liberals as little as the Conservatives, for of two hundred amendments on the notice-paper half were proposed by the supporters of the Government. But the tactics of the Conservatives then became apparent. Mr. Joshua Fielder, Member for the Eastern Division of the West Riding, was the first, directly the House had resolved itself into Committee, to make a long speech against the Bill appropriate only to the second reading, and others, including Lord John Manners, adopted the same course; Mr. Foster remonstrating and attempting to bring the House to reason. Lord Claud Hamilton indulged in a long dissertation on all things conceivable,—especially the number of nights given to the Maynooth debate in times past—the Irish Church and the Act of Union, concluding with the sufficiently strong assertion that honourable Members wished for the Ballot not to prevent but to cloak bribery. “Impunity was their object, and persistency in evil practices their desire.” Mr. Beresford Hope and Mr. George Bentinck, whose speeches during the session outdid by far in quantity all previous efforts of oratory recorded in parliamentary history, attacked Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Disraeli indiscriminately, and constituted themselves the especial champions of this new and singular form of opposition. But for an equally extraordinary course taken by the Liberals, they must have succeeded in preventing the Bill from passing the Commons. A meeting of 274 Liberal Members was held in Downing Street, to deliberate on the best course of securing its success, and Mr. Gladstone induced its adherents not only to

withdraw their amendments, but to abstain from debating the merits of the Bill, or the proposals of their opponents. A curious scene took place in the House on the resumption of the debate. On Mr. Newdegate rising to conclude a speech which he had left unfinished, the Liberal party gradually left the House, until the benches on that side were tenanted only by two or three Ministers, and just three private Members—Mr. Muntz, Mr. Martin, and Mr. Osborne. Presently two or three Opposition members crossed the House and took their places on the empty seats. Their example was followed by others, and in a short time a considerable body of Conservatives had migrated and settled themselves on the Liberal benches below the gangway.

The course thus begun was resolutely and persistently followed up by the Ministerial party, whose calculated silence naturally excited the resentment of their opponents; and a few Conservative members, with a pugnacity which seemed to all moderate men inexcusable, carried on a resolute and one-sided attack upon the Bill for five or six weeks. Mr. Beresford Hope, Mr. Lowther, and the two Messrs. Bentinck were untiring in their assaults on the Government, while Mr. Foster, with unfailing patience, conducted a single-handed defence. When the provisions for secret voting were at last with difficulty adopted, some of the more independent Liberal Members began to take part in the discussion. Mr. Henry James, who had first acquired a parliamentary reputation by a spirited reproof of Mr. Gladstone's imminent tergiversation on Female Suffrage, with the aid of Mr. Harcourt defeated the Government on the proposal for charging the Rates with election expenses. Some of the other clauses of the Bill were withdrawn, notwithstanding Mr. Fawcett's indignant protest, and at last at the close of the Session the remainder was sent up to the House of Lords. The fate of the measure had been clearly foreseen. It is probable that the House of Lords would in any case have rejected it, especially as the old Whigs, represented by the Duke of Somerset and Lord Lyveden, still retained the opinions which, until lately, had been shared by Mr. Gladstone and his principal colleagues. The Marquis of Ripon (a title bestowed on Earl de Grey for his services in the Alabama matter), who, like Mr. Forster, had in former times supported the Ballot, was entrusted with the charge of the Bill. Lord Shaftesbury moved the rejection of the Bill on the plea of the late period of the Session, and, after a short debate, in which the Duke of Somerset made a spirited attack on the Government, the Bill was defeated by two to one. So deep was the scission between the Peers and the Government, that only forty-eight Peers could be induced to vote for the Ballot Bill at all, the rest of the Liberal Peers preferring to stay away.

Ninety-seven voted against the Bill, which was thus lost for the year, with very little regret, as far as could be discovered, on the part of the country, which, in spite of various "indignation meetings," seemed as little stirred by Liberal denunciations of the

House of Lords as it had been by Conservative denunciations of Mr. Gladstone's abuse of the Royal prerogative.

Of more than a hundred and thirty Ministerial bills presented to Parliament, the University Tests Bill alone, with some trifling exceptions, passed into an Act in its original shape. As the House of Lords had in the previous Session professed rather to postpone the University Tests Bill than to reject it, Mr. Gladstone prudently reintroduced it in the same terms. He was supported by a moderate majority against Mr. Stevenson's motion for the abolition of tests in divinity degrees, and against Mr. Fawcett's proposal to throw open clerical fellowships to laymen. When the Bill reached the House of Lords many members of the Conservative party and some of the ablest of the prelates recommended the acceptance of the compromise; but Lord Salisbury, with his usual vigorous recklessness, carried by a majority of five the imposition of a test which would have been sufficiently condemned by its novelty if it had not been otherwise untenable and worthless. "No person," he moved, "shall be appointed to the office of tutor, assistant-tutor, dean, censor, or lecturer in divinity, in any college now subsisting in the said universities, until he shall have made and subscribed the following declaration in the presence of the Vice-Chancellor, or in the University of Durham of the Warden—that is to say, 'I, A. B., do solemnly declare that while holding the office of (here name the office) I will not teach any thing contrary to the teaching or Divine authority of the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.'"

The amendment was opposed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Bishops of Oxford, Manchester, and Carlisle. Among the lay peers who spoke against it were the Duke of Somerset, Lord Lansdowne, Lord Westbury, and Lord Airlie. On the other hand, it was supported by the Bishops of Gloucester, Lincoln, and Salisbury, Lord Beauchamp, Lord Carnarvon, and Lord Colchester.

When the Bill was returned to the Commons, Mr. Hardy and other leading advocates of religious tests expressed their indifference to an illusory guarantee; and, finally, the House of Lords took courage to detach itself for once from Lord Salisbury's dangerous guidance. His proposal to insist on his chief amendment—the new test—was thrown out in the House of Lords by a majority of 39 (128 to 89), and the Bill, as it last came from the Commons, was agreed to and received the royal assent. The universities thus, for the first time, admitted all lay students of whatever religious creeds on equal terms.

The division list showed a considerable majority of bishops *against* insisting on the new test. Only the Bishops of Gloucester and Bristol (Dr. Ellicott), of Lichfield (Dr. Selwyn), and of Lincoln (Dr. Wordsworth) voted for it; against, voted the Archbishop of York (Dr. Thomson), the Bishop of Bath and Wells (Lord Arthur Hervey), of Carlisle (Dr. Goodwin), of Exeter (Dr. Temple), of Hereford (Dr. Atlay), of Oxford (Dr. Mackarness), of Ripon (Dr. Bickersteth), and of Salisbury (Dr. Moberly).

The question of tests and of denominational education was discussed more comprehensively and with greater animation on the introduction of Mr. Fawcett's Bill for opening to all sects the endowments of Trinity College, Dublin. The college itself had, in consequence of the disestablishment of the Irish Church, wisely determined to assent to the abolition of tests, and its representative, Mr. Plunket, the promising heir of a great oratorical reputation, had taken occasion, on a motion of Mr. Fawcett's for the production of correspondence, to challenge the Government to adopt or reject the liberal offer of his constituents. Mr. Fawcett made a forcible speech on the second reading of his Bill, and he was supported by Mr. Plunket and by Lord Crichton as a representative of Irish Protestantism; Mr. Pim and Sir Rowland Blennerhasset opposed the measure; and Mr. Gladstone delivered against the Bill a long and elaborate argument, from which neither friends nor adversaries were able to extract an opinion or a policy. It was only clear that the Minister was opposed to Mr. Fawcett's scheme, especially as he adopted the unusual course of instructing the Solicitor-General for Ireland to employ his facetious fluency in defeating the Bill by efflux of time in a morning sitting. Mr. Harcourt, who displayed his independence by a pointed attack on Mr. Gladstone, probably expressed the opinions of a large number of Liberal Members.

Besides the University Tests Bill the Government succeeded in passing a Trades' Union Bill involving an equitable compromise between extreme theories on either side; and, after some abortive attempts in previous sessions, the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill was finally repealed. Some interest was aroused by Mr. Gladstone's motion for a joint commission of both Houses on Indian finance. Mr. Disraeli, always, like Sir Robert Peel, the ready champion of the privileges of the House of Commons, objected to the proposal, and the Committee was afterwards confined to the House of Commons, on the ground that any Members who might be selected would be overborne by the superior knowledge of Peers who at home and in the East had been practically acquainted with Indian administration. The routine duty of proposing a grant of suitable provision for Prince Arthur, as in the case of Princess Louise, was not discharged without protests from half a dozen Members of democratic tendencies. On both occasions the House assented to the grants by overwhelming majorities, and yet with an uneasy feeling that the prolonged eclipse of the splendour of Royalty had perceptibly diminished for the time the popularity of the Crown.

When the close of the tedious debates on Purchase and on the Ballot at last left the House at leisure to deal with general questions, strong dissatisfaction, in consequence of a series of untoward events, was expressed with the naval and military administration. One result of Mr. Childers' continued illness had been that the responsibility for the loss of the "Captain" was not even yet definitely settled, and the loss of the troop-ship "Megæra" aggravated the doubts which had been entertained as to the expediency of recent

changes at the Admiralty. The "*Megæra*," which had long since been placed at the bottom of the list of store-ships, as comparatively unfit for service, was, through some unexplained caprice, selected by the authorities to convey a large number of naval officers and seamen to Australia in the early part of this year. In the short passage between Plymouth and Cork the ship was found to be overloaded, and having proceeded on her voyage she was finally run aground on an island in the Southern Ocean in a sinking state. During her stay at Queenstown Mr. Baxter, representing the Admiralty in the interregnum between Mr. Childers and Mr. Goschen, had contradicted with more than official bluntness the complaints which had been preferred by well-informed Members; but when the loss of the ship was discussed Mr. Baxter was judiciously silent.

Sir J. Hay, in asking for information on the subject, stated that the "*Megæra*" was properly a store-ship, and that, apart from any question as to her safety, she ought not to have been used as a troop-ship on account of her imperfect steam-power and slow rate of speed. In the beginning of this year she was ordered to be surveyed at Sheerness, but the cost of a thorough survey being greater than the department thought it right to incur, the expenditure was checked, although it was reported that the plates at the bottom of the vessel were considerably worn. When the subject was referred to in the House of Commons, the replies of the Secretary of the Admiralty were of the most flippant and even insolent character. It was quite evident why the "*Megæra*" went down. The plates were worn out, and there was a hole in her, and consequently it was necessary to run her ashore.

Mr. Goschen, assuming entire responsibility for sending the "*Megæra*" to sea, though he had only been a very short time at the Admiralty, asked the House to suspend its judgment as to the exact cause of the disaster until particulars arrived, and mentioned that, fortunately, the ship had forty tons of provisions intended for Sydney besides her own stores, so that the crew and passengers would have ample supplies at command. Moreover, in addition to the steamer chartered from Hong Kong, which was expected to arrive about August 29, her Majesty's ship "*Rinaldo*" had been ordered to proceed from Singapore with provisions. In consequence of the remonstrances of the captain and of the officers who were passengers on board the "*Megæra*," he directed the examination of the ship at Queenstown. She was reported to be overcrowded, and to have leaky ports; but when 100 tons of cargo had been removed, and the ports repaired, she was reported fit for sea, and sailed accordingly. No reference was made to the thinness of the plates at the bottom of the ship in any of the complaints which reached the Admiralty at this time. Before being commissioned she had been twice docked within a short time, and her defects repaired. Mr. Barnaby, the assistant constructor, then reported as follows:—
"I beg leave to state that the '*Megæra*,' having undergone repair

at Sheerness, is reported to be complete. She is a good sea-boat, and, although more than twenty years old, is sound and strong. Her boilers are, however, only good for one year's service." As she was only wanted for a nine months' trip, this warranty seemed sufficient. The account which had been given of the ship by the different officers who had commanded her down to 1870 were all favourable. No trace of any report by Mr. Reed as to the thinness of the bottom of the "*Megæra*" could be found at the Admiralty, but it was true that he surveyed her in 1866, when she was reported fit for two years' service at a certain expense, had repeatedly passed estimates for her repairs, and approved her use, and never gave a hint, as far as he could ascertain, of her unseaworthiness, even to Mr. Barnaby, his own assistant and relative. As to Mr. Reed not being allowed to communicate with the First Lord and other officials at the Admiralty after he retired, all that Mr. Childers refused to do was to receive private communications on public matters. A week after the ship sailed a question was put in the House, apparently on information supplied by Mr. Reed, and he would only say that he would rather be himself with his ignorance of that report than he would be any one else who knew that the plates were thin and did not state it. The affair, Mr. Goschen said, was a most serious one, which must be rigidly inquired into, but in the meantime he deprecated exaggerated statements which might destroy the confidence of the navy, and create something like a panic.

Lord Henry Lennox explained that the Board of Admiralty, to which he was attached, after the report that she was fit only for eighteen months' or two years' service, placed her at the bottom of the ships to be employed; and though during their tenure of office a great pressure came upon them to provide ships for carrying stores in connexion with the Abyssinian war, they did not employ the "*Megæra*," and did not deem her sufficiently seaworthy for such a voyage as would then have been necessary. Mr. Goschen's statement was based upon the false assumption that the leakage of the "*Megæra*" which was reported at Queenstown came from the main-deck ports. It was not to be supposed that either the captain or the admiral at Queenstown would dream of examining the bottom of a ship which had just been despatched on a voyage round the world; they would take it for granted that the Admiralty had seen to that, and would never have sent out a ship under such circumstances. As to the reports of officers who had been out in the ship at different times, nobody disputed that she was a good vessel in her day, but wore out in the course of time.

In a less important matter—which nevertheless excited strong local interest—Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Lowe unnecessarily exposed the Government to defeat. Epping Forest to the East Londoner is like Continental Europe to the middle class. Lying within an easy distance of Hackney, Bethnal Green, Stepney, Limehouse, and Bow, it is the favourite and only resort for fresh air to the great mass of

cockney holiday-makers. Epping Forest is a Royal Common, with royal rights of Forest over it, and real deer—now dwindling, it is true, to some dozen phantom specimens—wandering within its precincts. If it were not for these privileges, the Common of Waltham Forest—which is the proper name of Epping—would long since have been eaten up by the advance of building speculations. Under the Enclosure Act, unfortunately, the process of absorption began. The trustees of Lord Cowley, who is owner of the larger proportion of the manors which make up the Forest, began to enclose in every direction; and this bad example was followed by other Lords of the Manor at Walthamstow, Chingford, Chigwell, West Hatch, Sewardstone, Thoydon Bois, and Loughton. If instant and strenuous resistance had not been made to these encroachments, the whole heritage of Londoners in the Common rights of Epping would have been filched away without redress. The Crown had the power to interfere in virtue of those forestal privileges which royalty claimed over the ancient deer forests of Waltham; but, instead of exercising those rights to keep Epping intact, the Commissioners of Woods and Forests began to sell the rights of the Crown to the Lords of the Manor at a few pounds per acre. Fortunately, Mr. Fawcett and other Members protested energetically in the House of Commons against the encroachments. The Government were compelled to move in the matter, and a Bill was brought in appointing a Commission to investigate and settle the rights of the Crown, the Commoners, and the Lords of the Manor. The Commission, as at first proposed by Mr. Ayrton, was to consist of two gentlemen connected with the locality, but in no way representing the people who enjoy the advantages of Epping, and of one barrister representing the Enclosure Commissioners. After strong protests from Mr. Harcourt and Mr. Fawcett, Mr. Locke, the member for Southwark, was added to the Commission; and a motion by Mr. Cowper-Temple for preserving the Forest was carried against the Government by a decisive majority. Not more successful was an attempt, audaciously made and arrogantly persisted in, to wrest from the citizens of London, under colour of Crown rights, their fair share of the land lying beside the western portion of the Thames Embankment. On this point Mr. Gladstone saw his majority split up, and found himself threatened with defeat by a Conservative private Member. Then, and not till then, did he yield so far as to accept by way of compromise an inquiry before a Select Committee. The Chancellor of the Exchequer and his subordinates fought the battle for the alleged rights of the Crown with remarkable obstinacy before this Committee, but in vain. The Report of the Committee was formally considered, and a resolution proposed by Mr. Smith, the member for Westminster, was adopted, affirming the propriety of granting a lease of the disputed land lying between Whitehall and the embankment to the Metropolitan Board of Works, in order that it might be set apart as a public garden for purposes of recreation.

The Deceased Wife's Sister's Bill, passed as usual by the Com-

mons, was this year thrown out by the Lords, with an increased majority (97 to 71); and Mr. Jacob Bright's Bill for conceding the Parliamentary franchise to female householders, if single women, was defeated by 220 to 151, after a debate in which the honours were carried away by Mr. Bright himself, who argued his case in the regular fashion, but with clearness and fairness; and by Mr. H. James (Taunton), who made a bold and incisive speech against the Bill; reminded Mr. Gladstone that, "if fame had no past, popularity had no future;" declared that the "sympathetic element in the nature of women blinded them to all logic;" argued that girls could not have a regular training in the world to fit them for political life; deprecated the influence the Bill would give to the clergy, and knocked to pieces the argument from the Throne by saying that her Majesty, specially trained by statesmen as she was, obeyed "the guidance and direction of a foreigner, simply because she was a woman and he was a man." The speech greatly raised Mr. James's position in the House. It was the speech of a man who was weary of talking around a subject, and went straight to the root of the matter. Mr. Bouverie argued that the claim came mainly from philosophers, who would relax marriage; and another speaker hinted that all strong-minded women were ugly.

The most remarkable point in the Debate was the half adhesion of the Premier, who seemed to think a visit to the polling-booth would injure women, but that, the ballot once established, they might be admitted to the franchise—an intimation which drew from Mr. Henry James, in the same speech, a spirited and earnest rebuke of Mr. Gladstone's instability and love of paradox.

Mr. Gladstone was more firm, however—at all events for the moment,—in his resistance to a scheme of another description.

There was a large attendance of members when Mr. Miall rose to propose a resolution, declaring that it is expedient at the earliest practical period to apply the policy initiated by the disestablishment of the Irish Church to the other Churches established by law in the United Kingdom.

Before the hon. gentleman was allowed to commence his speech, Mr. Gathorne Hardy deposited upon the table a large roll of paper, and, amid the cheers of the gentlemen sitting behind him, informed the Speaker that it was a petition from Bradford, signed by 24,700 persons, against the motion about to be submitted to the House.

Mr. Miall took no notice of this incident; but, entering at once upon the subject, moved, "That it is expedient, at the earliest practicable period, to apply the policy initiated by the disestablishment of the Irish Church to the other churches established by law in the United Kingdom." He presented the question, not as a Dissenters' grievance, but as a matter of national policy; and in combating the usual objections to an abstract resolution, he said his chief object was to ascertain practically how far the House was disposed to apply to Great Britain those principles which it had put into operation in Ireland. Vindicating the opportuneness of the

motion, he disclaimed all hostility to the Church or Church parties; and he asserted that the *raison d'être* of the Establishment had disappeared, and that she herself was convulsed by internal dissensions. Next he went on to argue that the Church system had failed in every way, and that it was unwise any longer to be bound by its fetters. It had failed to secure universality, harmony, and uniformity of worship; and it had failed to supply the spiritual wants of the country, for the greater part of recent Church extensions were due to the voluntary principle working within its borders, not to connexion with the State. On the unjust appropriation of the whole ecclesiastical revenues of the country to one particular Church he expatiated at length; and he held that the precedent of Ireland was conclusive in favour of the Disestablishment of the Church in England. Next he touched on the social mischiefs of an Established Church, and on the disadvantages to the Church of being cramped by state control, and urged that she would be all the safer by Disestablishment when the time of revolutionary attacks should come.

Mr. J. D. Lewis seconded the motion, treating it from the point of view of a Churchman desiring ecclesiastical freedom.

Mr. Bruce opposed the motion on the part of the Government as inopportune in point of time, and unjustified by any legislation of past years. And Sir R. Palmer, because, among other mischiefs which disestablishment would work, it would weaken or destroy the Church which is "the very inheritance" of the poor, both in rural parishes and in the poor populous districts of great towns and cities.

* This argument was met by Mr. H. Richard by reference to the case of Wales, where the neglect of the ministers of the Establishment had been repaired by the exertions of Nonconformists, and of Churchmen acting according to the voluntary principle.

When Mr. Scourfield had resisted, and Mr. W. Williams had supported the motion, Dr. Ball, with true Irish vehemence, denounced the half-heartedness with which Mr. Bruce had opposed the resolution, and asserted that the Church would be defended as long as the defence did not peril the existence of the Ministry, and would be abandoned as soon as its desertion could secure their safety.

Mr. Disraeli remarked that the proposal was a reversal of the policy of the old Puritans, who had always appealed to the temporal power in spiritual matters; and he answered the argument, founded on continental and Irish precedents, by examining the consequences of disestablishment in France and Ireland. The Irish precedent, he admitted, led logically to the disestablishment of the Church here, but we were governed more by rhetoric than logic, and fortunately, for the experience of Irish disestablishment was not encouraging. Who, he asked, prompted this appeal to the House of Commons? In answering this, Mr. Disraeli expressed a confident belief that the great majority, both in the House and in the country, was decidedly in favour of the Church. He attributed the movement to Noncon-

formists allied for the moment with revolutionary philosophers. Mr. Miall, he held, should have furnished some better evidence that the Church of England had ceased to be the Church of the English. He himself maintained, as a matter beyond a dispute, that the Church was predominant, in the rural districts at least. As to the large towns, if the majority was not in communion with the Church, neither was it with Dissent. But Mr. Disraeli looked with great confidence to the future efforts of the Church in the great towns. Even now a *plébiscite* would be in her favour; but an educated and a cultivated people, he believed, would be more and more in sympathy with her each year if she conducted herself discreetly. Criticizing Mr. Bruce's halting tone, Mr. Disraeli expressed a hope that the Prime Minister would lay down some principle which the country could understand; and concluded a brilliant peroration by declaring that he should oppose the motion more in the interests of the State than of the Church.

Mr. Gladstone's response to this appeal was for once as decided as could be desired: and he showed himself firmer than his subordinate, who would have served his party better by establishing a reputation at the Home Office than by encouraging Mr. Miall's proposal (which of course miscarried), under colour of a faint opposition. As it was, no individual Minister was so responsible as Mr. Bruce for the blunders and misconduct of the Session. The greater number of the abortive schemes of the year related to domestic legislation. The Prison Ministers' Bill was only one of many which would have readily been adopted by the House of Commons if they had been pressed forward by an efficient and vigorous Minister; while the Mines Regulation Bill, the Improvement of the Licensing System, and many other measures entrusted to Mr. Bruce were urgently needed for the public welfare. But domestic legislation was wholly at a stand under his auspices; though when the Sessions closed, he had pledged the Government to deal, "at a future time," with a score of different subjects.

The Treaty of Washington, concluded in May, was not discussed in Parliament until August. The British Commissioners were Lord De Grey, Sir Stafford Northcote, Professor Bernard, Sir Edward Thornton, and Sir John Macdonald; the American,—Mr. Hamilton Fish, General Schenck, Justice Nilson, Mr. Ebenezer Hoar, and Mr. George H. Williams. The first formal meeting of the Commission was held on February 27; and on March 8, the Alabama Claims question was considered. The American Commissioners on that day stated to the Commission, that the Government and people of the United States felt that they had sustained a great wrong, and that great injuries and losses were inflicted upon their commerce and their material interests, by the course and conduct of Great Britain during the recent rebellion in the United States; that the occurrences in Great Britain and her colonies during that period gave rise to feelings in the United States which the people of the United States did not desire to cherish towards Great Britain; that the

history of the Alabama and the other cruisers which had been fitted out, armed, or equipped, or had received augmentation of force in Great Britain or her colonies, and of the operations of those vessels, showed extensive and direct losses by the capture and destruction of a large number of vessels with their cargoes, and also in the heavy national expenditure in the pursuit of the cruisers, and the indirect injury in the transfer of a large part of the American commercial marine to the British flag, the enhanced payment of insurance, the prolongation of the war, and the addition of a large sum to the cost of the war and the suppression of the rebellion. They continued, that this also showed that Great Britain, by reason of failure in the proper observance of her duties as a neutral, had become justly liable for the acts of these cruisers and their tenders; that the claims for the loss and destruction of private property which thus far had been presented had amounted to about \$14,000,000 without interest—an amount liable to be greatly increased by claims not yet presented; that the cost to which the Government had been put in the pursuit of cruisers could easily be ascertained by certificates of Government accounting officers; that in the hope of an amicable settlement no estimate was made of the indirect losses, without prejudice, however, to the right of indemnification on their account in the event of no such settlement being made. The American Commissioners also pronounced the hope that the British Commissioners would be able to place upon record an expression of regret by her Majesty's Government for the depredations committed by the vessels, the acts of which are under discussion; and they proposed that the Joint High Commission should agree upon a sum which should be paid by Great Britain to the United States in satisfaction of all the claims and the interest upon them.

To this the British Commissioners replied, that her Majesty's Government could not admit that Great Britain had failed to discharge towards the United States the duties imposed on her by the rules of international law, or that she was justly liable to make good to the United States the losses occasioned by the acts of the cruisers referred to. They reminded the Americans that several vessels suspected of being designed to cruise against the United States, including two ironclads, had been arrested or detained by the British Government, and that Government had in some instances not confined itself to the discharge of international obligations, however widely construed, as, for instance, it had acquired, at a great cost, control of the Anglo-Chinese flotilla, which it was apprehended might be used against the United States. They continued that, although Great Britain had from the beginning disavowed any responsibility for the acts of the Alabama and the other vessels, she had already shown her willingness, for the sake of the maintenance of friendly relations with the United States, to adopt the principle of arbitration, provided that a fitting arbitrator could be found, and that an agreement could be arrived at as to the points to which arbitration should apply. They would therefore abstain

from replying in detail to the statement of the American Commissioners, in the hope that the necessity for entering upon a lengthened controversy might be obviated by the adoption of so fair a mode of settlement as the arbitration they were instructed to propose.

The American Commissioners regretted this decision of the British Commissioners, and said they could not consent to submit the question of the liability of her Majesty's Government to arbitration unless the principles which should govern the arbitrator could be agreed upon.

The British Commissioners replied that they had no authority to agree to a submission of these claims to an arbitrator, with instructions as to the principles which should govern their consideration. They would be willing to consider what principles should be adopted for observance in future, but they were of opinion that the best mode of conducting an arbitration was to submit the facts to the arbitrator, and leave him free to decide on them after hearing argument.

The American Commissioners answered that they were willing to consider what principles should be laid down for observance in similar cases in future, with the understanding that any principles which should be agreed upon should be held to be applicable to the facts in respect to the Alabama Claims.

The British Commissioners rejoined that they could not admit that there had been any violation of existing principles of international law; and that their instructions did not authorize them to accede to a proposal for laying down rules for the arbitrator's guidance, but that they would make known to their Government the American views on the subject.

During the remainder of March and the beginning of April the Joint High Commission considered the form of the declaration of principles which the American Commissioners desired to be adopted, the British Commissioners being in constant communication with London. On April 5, the latter stated they had been instructed to declare that her Majesty's Government could not assent to the proposed rules, as a statement of principles of international law which were in force at the time the Alabama Claims arose, but that her Majesty's Government, in order to evince its desire of strengthening friendly relations and making satisfactory provision for the future, agreed that in deciding the questions arising out of the claims, the arbitrator should assume that her Majesty's Government had undertaken to act upon the principles set forth in the rules proposed by the American Commissioners. These rules were those adopted finally as a part of the Treaty, and they were agreed upon at that Session of the Commission.

Several Sessions subsequently in April were spent in considering the form of the submission and the mode of appointing the arbitrator. The American Commissioners during this period referred to the hope above announced as to an expression of British regret; and to this the British Commissioners replied that they were autho-

rized to express in a friendly spirit the regret felt by her Majesty's Government for the escape, under whatever circumstances, of the Alabama and other vessels from British ports, and for the depredations committed by those vessels. The American Commissioners accepted this expression of regret as very satisfactory to them, and as a token of kindness, and said they felt sure it would be so received by the Government and people of the United States. The articles of the Treaty referring to the Alabama Claims were then agreed to.

The British counter-claims and other claims between the countries were then considered. In the course of debating these matters the American Commissioners stated that they supposed they were right in the opinion that British laws prohibit British subjects from owning slaves, and they therefore inquired whether any claim for slaves, or for any alleged property or interest in slaves, can or will be presented by the British Government, or in behalf of any British subject, under the Treaty in negotiation, if there be in the Treaty no express words excluding such claims. The British Commissioners replied that by the law of England, British subjects had long been prohibited from purchasing or dealing in slaves, not only within the dominions of the British Crown, but in any foreign country; and that they had no hesitation in saying that no claim on behalf of any British subject for slaves, or for any property or interest in slaves, would be presented by the British Government.

The British Commissioners then proposed that the Joint High Commission should consider the claims for injuries which the people of Canada had suffered from the Fenian raids. The American Commissioners objected to this, and it was agreed that the subject might be brought up again. On April 14 the form of the Commission for the settlement of the British counter-claims, &c., was determined upon; and on April 26 the Fenian raid claims were again brought up. The British Commissioners said they were instructed to present these claims, and to state that they were regarded by her Majesty's Government as coming within the class of subjects designed for the consideration of the Joint High Commission. The American Commissioners replied that they were instructed to say that the Government of the United States did not regard these claims as coming within the class of subjects designed for the Commission, and that they were without any authority from their Government to consider them. They, therefore, declined to do so. The British Commissioners then referred to London, and on May 3, at the Conference, they stated that they were instructed to express their regret that the American Commissioners were without authority to deal with the question of the Fenian raids, and they inquired if that was still the case. The American Commissioners replied that they could see no reason to vary the reply formerly given to this proposal—that in their view the subject was not embraced in the scope of the original correspondence between Mr. Thornton and Mr. Fish, that they did not feel justified in entering

upon the consideration of any class of claims not contemplated at the time of the creation of the present Commission, and that the claims referred to did not recommend themselves to their favour. The British Commissioners then said that under the circumstances they would not urge further that the settlement of these claims should be included in the present Treaty, and that they had the less difficulty in doing so as a portion of the claims were of a constructive and inferential character.

The remainder of the Protocols referred to the fisheries, Canadian navigation, and the north-west boundary. In relation to the fisheries, the Treaty gave to the fishermen of the United States full power to fish (for the ten years, which was the duration of this part of the Treaty) on the coasts of British North America, without any restrictions as to the distance from the shore,—but this liberty applied only to sea-fishery, not to salmon, or shad, or shell-fish fisheries, the river fisheries being reserved exclusively for British subjects. In return, British subjects might fish in like manner on the shores of the United States down to the 39th parallel. The balance of advantage being, as maintained by Great Britain and denied by the United States, in favour of the United States, a Commission was appointed to estimate the value of it (if any), and such a sum was to be paid down for it to the Dominion as the Commission should decide.

On May 4 the entire Treaty was framed; on May 6 the Protocols were agreed upon; and on May 8 the Treaty was signed, and the labours of the Commission terminated.

The Treaty was ratified by the American Senate by a majority of 50 to 12 votes. Mr. Sumner, in a hostile speech, declared the English apology inadequate, and asserted that an apology for the admission of belligerent rights to the South was requisite, nor would he have admitted the English counter-claims. The fact of Mr. Sumner's dissent perhaps went further to reconcile Parliament to the Treaty than any thing else, as any agreement likely to please him must have been unworthy indeed. As it was, however, there were not wanting some few who declined to join in the general congratulation on the conclusion of the Treaty, Lord Russell moving an address to the Queen against it, though the motion was withdrawn.

Towards the close of the session deep and general dissatisfaction was expressed at the abandonment, on most inadequate pretences, of certain proposed manœuvres in Berkshire, about which much expectation had been raised. The prospect of the expedition thus abandoned had been held out from the outset of the session as an earnest of the various measures contemplated by the Government for bringing our various forces together, and training them for effective co-operation in active service. Mr. Cardwell stated in his opening speech that "it is one part of the Government plan to make arrangements for brigading the Regulars, Militia, and Volunteers more largely than has been the case in the past," and the House was repeatedly told that the clause in the Army Bill by which the

Volunteers were to be placed under the Mutiny Act was urgently required for this purpose. Accordingly arrangements for forming a Camp of Exercise were for some time in progress. Committees were appointed; the commanding officer at Aldershott and two of his subordinates visited the district proposed for the evolutions, and reported on its fitness for the proposed operations. Every thing promised a useful experiment. All indulged the hope that the pledges of the Government would be fulfilled, and that a real effort would at length be made to afford our army the benefit of practical training in the art of war. Suddenly all these good intentions and preparations collapsed. Incredible as it may seem, it appeared, on the publication of the official reports, that the Inspector and Quartermaster-General had observed that the weather might possibly be wet. There was no sign in their reports of any reluctance on the part of the military officers to undertake the task proposed for them. Of course, it was their business to indicate any difficulties they might foresee, in order that due preparation might be made for surmounting them. But so far from suggesting the abandonment of the campaign, they proceeded to show in general terms how the forces employed should be conveyed to the scene of operations. The two officers reported that, in consequence of the lateness of the harvest, there were likely to be more difficulties than had been anticipated, and they observed that, should the autumn be wet, encampment on the arable land, of which that part of Berkshire principally consists, would be objectionable; but they prudently added (what Lord Northbrook as prudently omitted in his explanation in the House), that "should the autumn be dry, no objection or inconveniences are to be expected." In short, the troops would have to take the risk of encountering "objectionable" or favourable weather—a risk to which soldiers are supposed to be always exposed. This report seems to have caused an immediate panic among the unknown authorities at head-quarters. On the same day it was received, a Council was held at the War Office, at which the same two officers were directed to inspect the district in the neighbourhood of Aldershott, and to offer alternative schemes. They reported accordingly that the country between Aldershott and Chobham was very suitable for manœuvres, and the original plan was abandoned just when the plans of the campaign were prepared, the military officers were ready to do their part, the farmers of the district, with creditable public spirit, had offered their co-operation, the public were expectant, and the Government had an admirable opportunity for dissipating the suspicions cast upon the genuineness of their military reforms. The Duke of Somerset's reproach to the Government for providing "a navy that could not swim and an army that could not march," conveyed an impression too widely entertained. Few more severe criticisms could be passed upon an army than to pronounce it incapable of encountering the risk of the rain and wind of an English autumn in a southern county.

It would be useless to dwell at greater length on the achievements of this unlucky session. One other Bill the Government passed, to which later in the year unpleasant attention was to be directed. Most unwillingly, and under great pressure from Lord Westbury and others, the Lord Chancellor consented to bring in a bill for the appointment of some paid judges on the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, to do away at last with the crying scandal which had arisen from the accumulating arrears of Indian and other appeals. It was enacted that four judges should, or might, be appointed on salaries of 5000*l.* a year (inclusive of any pension they might hold), two being ex-Indian Chief Justices, and two judges of the superior Common Law Courts. This was one of the closing features of the session, which was brought to an end on the 21st of August amid a universal sense of uneasiness and disapproval, which appeared vaguely to have communicated itself to the Queen's closing speech.

With whomsoever the blame was to rest, the fact was patent that the House of Commons this year to some extent impaired the confidence of the country in Parliamentary Government. Charges and recriminations exchanged between Ministers and Opposition members involved on both sides the admission that the House had failed both in legislation and in its function of supervising administrative business. The time of the House of Commons was fully occupied down to a tardy prorogation, and yet of the long list of measures imprudently announced in the Speech from the Throne very few passed into law, and the chief practical result of the session was achieved, not by the action of Parliament, but by an irregular exercise of the powers of the Crown.

The prevailing discontent with the Government took tangible shape and form. During the summer the House and London society suffered a great loss in the sudden death of Mr. Charles Buxton, the honest and earnest Liberal member for East Surrey. In the election that ensued the Liberals were badly beaten, though every thing was against the Tories. Their candidate, Mr. Watney, was an utterly unknown man, who could not speak, and read to the electors papers evidently written for him, and professing the most primitive and fossil opinions, and the villa population, always Conservative, were at the sea-side. On the other hand, the Liberals had a fair candidate, Mr. Leveson Gower, who spoke out clearly and strongly, and the great advantage of the unbroken tradition of four-and-twenty years. Still they were beaten by 3889 to 2770. The party would not vote, and while the Tories brought up 300 more voters than at the last election, the Liberals were less by 1800, or one clear third.

Later in the year the same change took place on a vacancy occurring at Plymouth—an old Liberal stronghold; and a Conservative stranger was returned by a considerable majority over a well-known and popular local Liberal. Many little causes might be at work in both instances, of which the general and vigorous opposi-

tion of the publican interest, which had been enlisted against the Government, was no doubt the chief. But all allowance made for that and other causes, it was impossible to avoid the conviction that Liberalism, for the time at all events, was on the decline,

CHAPTER IV.

The Situation in France—Democracy at Home—Mr. Bruce and the Demonstration in Trafalgar-square—Royal Visit to Dublin—Proposed Meeting in Phoenix-park—Conflict between the Nationalists and the Police—The French Deputation—Election of Mr. Smyth—Mr. Gladstone on Home Rule—His Speech at Whitby—Alarmists—Mr. Gladstone at Greenwich—The “Seven Points” and New Social Alliance—Mr. Scott Russell—Sir Charles Dilke—His Career—His Speech at Newcastle—Anti-Republican Riots—The Dangerous Illness of the Prince of Wales—Excitement and Enthusiasm throughout the Country and Colonies—English Loyalty—The Last Ministerial Difficulty—Appointment of Sir R. Collier to the Privy Council, and Protest of Sir A. Cockburn—Prevalence of Strikes—The Strike at Newcastle—Strike of the Telegraph Clerks.

WITH unabating interest, however much occupied in domestic concerns and debates, did the House and the country watch the progress of events in France throughout this memorable year; scarcely less memorable in the history of that distracted nation than the year which had preceded it. It is no part of this portion of our work to dwell upon the startling events which continued to follow each other in rapid succession upon the other side of the Channel, or to do more than note their effect upon the English mind. There was nothing, unhappily, in the conduct or attitude of the French Republic to keep alive or to justify the general sympathy which the apparent hardness of the German terms, coming to crown so unparalleled a course of disaster, had begun to evoke in England; and in the hideous struggle which culminated in the events of that “Black Wednesday,” when the burning streets and palaces of Paris presented so strange a contrast to the aspect of our own country, engaged in celebrating its annual Derby Day. “Sympathy” with either of the contending parties was out of the question. Only the conduct of the Versaillists, it was said and felt at the time, could have mitigated the horror and execration born of the acts of the Commune. Mr. Gladstone only gave voice to the general feeling when he rose in the House of Commons and expressed himself, “conscious there are no epithets which could adequately, or in any degree, give satisfaction to the feelings with which every man’s mind and heart must be oppressed,” under the impression created by events, “so entirely without any real precedent in history.” The stream of English charity, however, continued unchecked; as soon as the gates of Paris were opened after the Prussian siege, and again after the capture by the Versaillists, English food and English money was poured into the unhappy

capital; and unfortunately English tourists were not slow to follow, and make a sight of the smoking ruins, and the traces of blood and murder which in that city, so strangely compounded of order and disorder, were effaced more rapidly and easily than the remains of a snowfall in the streets of London. The French were at the time in a mood rather to resent our curiosity, than to be grateful for our charities; and private acknowledgments, however handsome, from M. Thiers or M. Jules Favre, of the value of English assistance, could scarcely be accepted as indicative of a national feeling. But later in the year a society was formed in Paris for the purpose of offering to England some lasting token of French tribute. This association, composed of landed proprietors, merchants, tradesmen, and peasants, named a Committee to sit daily in the Rue Vivienne and receive signatures from Frenchmen of all classes—a separate sheet of parchment being set aside for each department, and illuminated with the arms of the department and its principal towns. The association hoped to receive between five and six million signatures before the spring, and it was proposed that the sheets should then be bound in “livres d’or,” and handed over to the presidents of the different English charitable funds.

In the face of these facts France was not lightly to be accused of indifference and ingratitude, though our quiet course of prosperity at home, sheltered by the streak of silver sea, was such as might well excite the envy of our perplexed neighbours. Happily for the moment, whatever it might prove in the long run, England was in a phase of strange indifferentism. There were not wanting observers, and very acute observers, too, who predicted, some with hope and some with dread, a coming and sudden development of Communism in Great Britain, who were oracular on the dark doings of the Internationale and the growing spirit of Republicanism. But the outward manifestations of the spirit, except so far as strikes were so to be considered, were singularly weak, and even laughable; and such democrats as Messrs. Odger and Bradlaugh seemed the merest caricatures by the side of their terrible brethren in France. Mr. Odger was laughingly accused by one of his own friends, at one democratic meeting, of having been reduced to “raffling a blanket” in order to provide funds to carry on the publication of his especial democratic prints, and as laughingly admitted the imputation; while Mr. Bradlaugh, whose Republicanism was mainly confined to blasphemy, was generally disclaimed even by his friends.

One triumph the English democrats obtained in the course of the summer through the agency of Mr. Bruce. A “demonstration” in Trafalgar-square, which the democrats had announced their intention of holding, was prohibited by the police, under the orders of the Home Secretary. Formal notices of prohibition, headed with the Queen’s arms, were served on each of the leaders of the movement, who resolved to hold the meeting in despite of authority. The result of the anticipated struggle was to bring together the largest gathering ever known to have met in Trafalgar-square, who

crowded the column, fountains, and square, even to the steps of St. Martin's Church on the one side, and the entrance to the barracks on the other—in place, probably, of one of the scanty bodies of people who usually attended the summons of the English Republic. Meanwhile, the Home Secretary consulted the law officer—which he had before omitted to do—and discovered that he had no legal right to interfere with the meeting at all—a power which he had proposed to exercise under a statute of George III., which was now found to be entirely inapplicable. The prohibition was accordingly withdrawn, and the meeting held, with a factitious importance attached to it, due entirely to the proceedings of Mr. Bruce.

The bad effect of this singular display of administrative weakness was enhanced by certain occurrences which took place about the same time in Dublin, on the occasion of a royal visit paid by the Prince of Wales, with Prince Arthur, and the newly-married favourites of the hour, Princess Louise and the Marquis of Lorne¹. The visit had been in all respects apparently a success, except with the disaffected Nationalists, who, as a rule, kept out of the way of the royal party, and could not be conciliated by the green dress of the Princess, and the shamrock sprigs worn by Prince Arthur and the Marquis. This feeling of antagonism culminated in an attempt to hold a meeting in Phoenix-park, just before the departure of the visitors, to pray for the liberation of the military prisoners confined for Fenianism. As soon as announced the meeting was forbidden by the authorities, who on this occasion acted differently from their brothers-in-office at home, and dispersed the meeting, which, as in England, was persisted in, at the cost of the most violent riot which had been witnessed for a long time. Two prominent Nationalists, Mr. Smyth, M.P., and Mr. A. M. Sullivan, came in for a share of the violence of the police, which was excited to a considerable, if a justifiable, extent; and many others were more or less seriously injured. The promoter of the meeting afterwards issued the following address:—

“Fellow-countrymen,—While yet the Princes of England are guests of the Viceroy, the green sward of the Phoenix-park, close by their residence, has been reddened with the blood of the people. The royal visit has had a battue of peaceful citizens for its finale. Yesterday evening a lawful and constitutional assembly of the people in the public park was violently interrupted by an armed body of police, who savagely set upon the unarmed and unresisting crowd of men, women, and children, and soon left many of them weltering in their blood. And why has the blood of the people been shed by police brutality? If it was a crime for the public to assemble in the park, if a crowd upon its area was an offence against our rulers for which blood alone could atone, why was not the law announced or enforced against the tens of thousands who assembled there on Friday last? Why were the people struck down on the 6th for

¹ An account of this Visit will be found in the “Chronicle.”

that which was invited and approved on the 4th? Fellow-citizens, the answer is instructive. The thousands were gladly allowed to assemble as a right in the park on Friday, because it might make a holyday for Royalty. If the same object yesterday was to cheer a Prince, the police would not have shed the people's blood. But as the object was not to make the pleasure of Princes, but to plead for the liberation of captives, then the police had orders to draw their bludgeons, to beat, and maim, and wound a peaceful crowd of unarmed and inoffensive people.

"Fellow-citizens, this occurred at a moment when the Republicans of London are allowed to assemble in the public parks of that city, to express sympathy with the Commune of Paris and to assail the Crown and Constitution and the law. Once, when the Government of the day ventured to prohibit a public meeting for a political purpose in a London park, the populace tore down the railings of the enclosure, and the right to hold political meetings has never since been questioned. At present the Socialist and the infidel may freely address assemblages in the London parks. It is by the same Government that permits all this in London that the people of Dublin have been assailed in the public park of the Irish metropolis. Fellow-citizens, this savage and high-handed proceeding will not be allowed to pass without fitting action. The necessary legal steps will forthwith be taken to bring to account the persons responsible for this invasion of law and public right. We appeal to you to sustain us in contesting an issue so vitally important by bringing condign punishment on the perpetrators of this disgraceful and sanguinary outrage.

"P. J. SMYTH, Chairman.
J. NOLAN, } Hon.
T. D. SULLIVAN. } Secs."

The contradictory course of action pursued in London and in Dublin certainly gave considerable colour to the complaints of the Nationalists, and could not but give rise to severe reflection on the Government, and when the immediate effect of the riot had passed away, it was to be feared that in many quarters its lessons had not been forgotten. Very marked expressions of disaffection towards England, as well as enthusiasm for France, were observable, as well in the south of Ireland as in Dublin, on the occasion of the reception given to the members of a French deputation who came to Ireland a few days later in pursuance of an arrangement between the Irish Ambulance and French Aid Committee (two charitable societies which had been prominent in the cause of France during the war) but whose visit was conveniently treated as a spontaneous compliment paid to Ireland; and the *Nation* newspaper, the chief organ of the Nationalist cause, proclaimed that the magnificent displays with which the Count de Flavigny and his companions were greeted, were arranged not more out of love to France than for the purpose of showing hatred to England. Other signs were not wanting. Mr. Smyth, the Nationalist, who was hurt in the

riot, was returned to Parliament unopposed for the county of Westmeath, and an excited speaker, one Captain King-Harman, took occasion by the nomination to draw a favourable comparison (in respect of his personal safety) between the fields of Westmeath and the dark lanes of Sheffield, and to declare that the electors were sending a man to Parliament to tell Mr. Gladstone that his mock legislation was a humbug, and that they would not stand a "base, bloody, and brutal Whig in this country."

The shameful acquittal of Kelly for the murder of the policeman Talbot was the last and worst feature of the Irish year; but we have described it elsewhere², and are glad to be spared the necessity for further comment here.

The advocacy of "Home Rule" grew noisier, if not more threatening, as the year went on, and it was to the great satisfaction of the country that it at length drew from Mr. Gladstone a distinct and manly repudiation of the objects of the agitation, with which he had been accused of trifling if not of sympathizing. He took occasion of the freedom of the city of Aberdeen being conferred upon him to address an assembly of some 3000 people upon the subject. "I am not quite certain," he said, "what is meant in Ireland by the cry of Home Rule. I am glad to know from the mouths of those who raised that cry what it does not mean; they have told us emphatically by their principal organs that it does not mean the breaking up into fragments this United Kingdom. (Applause.) Well, that, after all, is a most important matter. This United Kingdom, which we have endeavoured to make a United Kingdom in heart as well as in law, we trust will remain a United Kingdom. (Loud applause.) And although as human beings, the issues of great events are not in our hands, but are directed by a higher Power, yet we intend and mean, every one of us, both high and low, not those merely who meet within this hall, but those who crowd the streets of your city, and every city from the north to the south of this island—we intend that it shall remain a United Kingdom. (Loud applause.) Unhappily," he concluded, "it has been one consequence of the policy towards Ireland in former times that those principles of self-reliance, those powers of local action, that energy and public spirit which are the inherited possessions of this country have been steadily enfeebled and crippled in the sister island; and therefore it is that these things, which in this country every day and every month that we live the various classes and the various communities are doing for themselves, the Irish people have not yet learnt in the same way to do; but I am bound to say they have not had the same opportunity of learning in the same degree to do for themselves, and hence they are liable to become more or less the victims from time to time of this or that political delusion. (Applause.) You would expect, when it is said that the Imperial Parliament is to be broken up, that at the very least a case should

² See "Chronicle."

be made out showing there were great subjects of policy, and great demands necessary for the welfare of Ireland, which representatives of Ireland had united to ask, and which the representatives of England, Scotland, and Wales had united to refuse. (Cheers.) There is no such grievance. There is nothing that Ireland has asked, and which this country and this Parliament have refused. This Parliament has done for Ireland what it would have scrupled to do for England and for Scotland. (Cheers.) There remains now a single grievance—a grievance with regard to university education, which is not so entirely free in Ireland as it has now been made in England; but that is an exceptional subject, and it is a subject on which I am bound to say Ireland has made no united demand upon England; still, I regard it as a subject that calls for legislation, but there is no demand which Ireland has made and which England has refused, and I shall be very glad to see such a demand put into a practical shape in which we may make it the subject of candid and rational discussion. What are the inequalities of England and Ireland? I declare that I know none, except that there are certain taxes still remaining which are levied over Englishmen and Scotchmen and which are not levied over Irishmen, and likewise that there are certain purposes for which public money is freely and largely given in Ireland and for which it is not given in England or Scotland. (Cheers.) That seems to me to be a very feeble case indeed for the argument which has been made by means of which, as we are told, the fabric of the united Parliament of this country is to be broken up. I admit that large allowance is to be made for our friends and fellow-countrymen in Ireland. Political virtues of self-reliance and practical energy are not the creation of a day. The circumstances under which Ireland was too long governed were hostile, nay, almost fatal to their growth. We ought rather to be pleased with her growing industry and her general freedom from crime than to complain that she is not something better than she has ever had an opportunity of becoming. But if the doctrines of Home Rule are to be established in Ireland, I protest on your behalf that you will be just as well entitled to it in Scotland (hear, hear); and, moreover, I protest on behalf of Wales, in which I have lived a good deal, and where there are 800,000 people, who to this day, such is their sentiment of nationality, speak hardly any thing but their own Celtic tongue—a larger number than speak the Celtic tongue, I apprehend, in Scotland, and a larger number than speak it, I apprehend, in Ireland—I protest on behalf of Wales that they are entitled to Home Rule there. (Applause.) Can any sensible man, can any rational man suppose that at this time of day, in this condition of the world, we are going to disintegrate the great capital institutions of this country for the purpose of making ourselves ridiculous in the sight of all mankind, and crippling any power we possess for bestowing benefits through legislation on the country to which we belong? (Applause.)

“One word more only on this subject, and it is this:—People say

that we have tried to conciliate Ireland, and that we have failed. I do not admit that Ireland is not going to be conciliated (applause), but I say this—that we must always keep in mind that there is a higher law to govern the actions of Parliament and of politicians than the law of conciliation, good as that law may be. (Cheers.) We desire to conciliate Ireland, we desire to soothe her people—the wounded feelings and the painful recollections of her people. We desire to attach her to this island in the silken cords of love (cheers), but there was a higher and a paramount aim in the measures that Parliament has passed, and that was that it should do its duty. It was to set itself right with the national conscience, with the opinion of the world, and with the principles of justice (loud cheers); and when that is done, I say fearlessly that, whether conciliation be at once realized or not, the position of this country is firm and invulnerable.” (Cheers.)

Mr. Gladstone was not idle after the close of the session, and, whatever the general opinion of the history of that session, he was, at least, not backward to defend it. In a speech at Whitby he declared that the Army Regulation Bill alone was sufficient to make and confer honour upon the session. At the last the power of the Crown was brought in, but it could not have been done without the Bill. As to the Ballot Bill, it might be confessing his ignorance, but he did not know that it would be rejected by the House of Lords, and he would not believe that it would be rejected by the House of Lords. It had been rejected, and he sincerely regretted it, but the time had not been lost; all the labour was not lost, which would have happened if they had let the House of Commons—the people's House—reject the people's Bill. The people's House had passed the people's Bill, and that Bill, when presented again at the door of the House of Lords, as he trusted it would be very early next session, would be presented with an authoritative knock which it would not otherwise have possessed. They had been abused for not doing sufficient work, but legislation was a very serious matter, and ought to be slow. Great scope ought to be given to reasonable discussions, and even unreasonable discussion. Haste in legislation worked greater mischief than delay. It had been the wisdom of the Legislature to prefer the legislation, which was slow and sure to that which was fitful and had often afterwards to be reversed. No doubt many a clever fellow writing in a newspaper could put his finger on many a blot on our legislation, and show how it might have been done, and he had no doubt that he thought he could have done it better himself.

In the same speech the Premier took occasion to issue his warning against “alarmism,” taking as his text a very clever magazine article which had caused a considerable sensation, describing an imaginary “Battle of Dorking,” in which the English were defeated and annihilated by the Prussian invader. “This disposition to alarm,” he said, “unfortunately sits worse upon us than upon any other people, and I will tell you why—because we have a reputation

in Europe, and I am afraid not altogether unjustly, of being rather an arrogant people; and if we are an arrogant people, and disposed to assert too much for ourselves, what in the world can be more ridiculous or deserve such profound contempt as to see these very people continually lashing themselves into a state of apprehension and panic, and endeavouring to persuade one another that all mankind are in a conspiracy against them? In *Blackwood's Magazine* there has lately been a famous article called 'The Battle of Dorking.' I should not mind this 'Battle of Dorking,' if we could keep it to ourselves, if we could take care that nobody belonging to any other country should know that such follies could find currency or even favour with portions of the British public; but unfortunately these things go abroad, and they make us ridiculous in the eyes of the whole world. I do not say that the writers of them are not sincere—that is another matter—but I do say that the result of these things is practically the spending of more and more of your money. Be on your guard against alarmism. Depend upon it there is not this astounding disposition on the part of all mankind to make us the objects of hatred. If we treat others well, then they upon the whole will treat us well. I believe we mean to treat them well, and, if so, I believe we shall usually be treated well by them in return. The power of this country," he concluded, "is not declining. It is increasing—increasing in itself, and I believe increasing as compared with the power of the other nations of Europe. It is only our pride, it is only our passions, it is only our follies, which can ever constitute a real danger to us. If we can master these, no other foe can hurt us; and many a long year will make its round, and many a generation of men will be gathered to its fathers, before the country in which we were born, and which we deeply love, need forfeit or lose its place among the nations of the world."

Later in the year Mr. Gladstone addressed his constituents at Greenwich in one of the most remarkable speeches that he ever made—remarkable as much for the surrounding circumstances as for the matter and manner of it. A covered hustings was erected on the north-eastern corner of Blackheath, in front of which an assembly, variously estimated at from 12,000 to 25,000 persons, was gathered; and for two continuous hours, bare-headed, did the Premier address this vast audience with unfaltering voice and unfailing energy. Amongst the crowd were a large number who had come with no object except to create an uproar, but the most persistent were soon hushed into silence by the power of the speaker's oratory—a triumph which those most opposed to him must admit to have been in its kind rarely rivalled. A contemporary report thus describes the scene on the arrival of the Premier at the hustings:—"The dense mass heaved, and there rose from it an audible gasp as a burst of cheering was heard in the offing. Nearer rolled the cheers, mingled with some yells, but the silence of keen expectancy reigned before the hustings. The door

at the back of the booth opened, there was some confusion among its occupants, and then here was Mr. Gladstone standing at the right hand of Mr. Angerstein. Then the throng broke the silence of expectancy. Peal after peal of cheering rent the air. There was a waving forest of hats. The cheering was spasmodic—it was too loud to be sustained, and ever, as it drooped a little, was audible a steady automaton-like hissing. But as yet there was little or no hooting, only the bitter persistent hissing in the lulls of the cheering. The noise that drowned Mr. Angerstein's introductory speech was simply indescribable. When his brief preface was over, Mr. Gladstone stood forward bareheaded. There was something deeply dramatic in the intense silence which fell upon the vast crowd when the renewed burst of cheering with which he was greeted had subsided. But the first word he spoke was the signal of a fearful tempest of din. From all around the skirts of the crowd rose a something between a groan and a howl. So fierce was it that for a little space it might laugh to scorn the burst of cheering that strove to overmaster it. The battle raged between the two sounds, and looking straight upon the excited crowd stood Mr. Gladstone, calm, resolute, patient. It was fine to note the manly British impulse of fair play that gained him a hearing when the first ebullition had exhausted itself, and the revulsion that followed so quickly and spontaneously on the realization of the suggestion that it was mean to hoot a man down without giving him a chance to speak for himself. After that Mr. Gladstone may be said to have had it all his own way. Of course, at intervals there were repetitions of the interruptions. When he first broached the dockyard question there was long, loud, and fervent groaning; when he named Ireland a cry rose, 'God save Ireland!' from the serried files of Hibernians that had rendezvoused on the left flank. But long before he had finished he had so enthralled his audience that impatient disgust was expressed at the handful who still continued their abortive efforts at interruption."

The speech itself ranged over all the topics then interesting the public mind, and was one of great power. One of the chief charges against the Government related to the dismissal of dockyard labourers, upon which question they had incurred much unpopularity. On this point Mr. Gladstone made the unanswerable defence of figures. "I will give you," he said, "in a concise form, the particulars. But, in the first place, let me say that, in my opinion, the closing or the restriction of Government establishments, so far from being a crime, may be a duty to the nation (cheers), and has been recognized as such duty by both parties when they have been in office. That it is a serious misfortune to many of those whom it affects I am the first to assert; but the true inference to be drawn from that is—what? Not that men are to be kept in indolence at the expense of the nation; not that useless work is to be created in order to employ them; but this, that the original creation of Government establishments, and that

every extension of Government establishments, ought to be watched with the utmost jealousy, and ought never to be allowed except upon clear and stringent necessity. (Cheers and interruption.) Now, with regard to dockyard labourers, listen to the figures, for they are worth hearing. The number of dockyard labourers employed on January 1, 1868, was 20,313. On December 1, 1868, which was the day before I received my summons to the presence of her Majesty at Windsor, that number of 20,313 had been reduced to 15,974. (Hear, hear.) The difference, showing the reduction since the beginning of the year, was 4359. The number of dockyard labourers which we found was 15,974; and the number of dockyard labourers on October 1 last, which is the latest return I can give you, was 14,511. (Cheers.) The result of that statement is that the reduction since we came into office has been 1463. The reduction before we came into office was 4359, so that three-fourths of the whole reduction of which we now hear so much were not our work, but the work of our predecessors. (Cheers.) But I have told you the work was a work not undertaken either by them or by us upon our own arbitrary will. A plan devised by a former Government, and sanctioned by a Committee of the House of Commons, on the application of that Government, was the plan which the present and the late Administration carried into effect."

Mr. Gladstone then proceeded to a general exposition and defence of the Government policy. "In attacking Purchase in the Army," he said, "we were perfectly well aware that we were assailing class interest in its most favourite stronghold, and I rejoice to think that in a single session we have been able to achieve the accomplishment of a work so formidable. (Cheers.) It is achieved at a great cost, because, when the people of England set about practical reforms, they never accomplish them in a niggardly spirit; but their practice is to make generous compensation to those who may have suffered, or may imagine themselves to suffer by them, and in every doubtful case to adopt the liberal course of action. But, gentlemen, what is the real case in the British army? Because you have been practised upon by writers who seem to find a kind of luxury in panic and alarm, and endeavour to propagate those feelings through the country; although for my part I regard them with little less of charity—I do not mean the people, but the rumours (a laugh),—with little less of goodwill or sympathy than I should regard the propagation of the small-pox or the cattle plague. (Cheers and laughter.) Gentlemen, we have always had in this country, both in officers and men, an army of the noblest and the very best material. (Cheers.) Allow me to give you a short anecdote to vary the weariness of my discourse. I dare say many of you may have heard the name of Bewick, who was a famous wood-cutter, and also an artist of great celebrity—a northern man. He lived, I think, in the time of the American war. Besides his wood-cutting he determined that, as it was a time of danger,

having an English heart in his bosom, he would learn a little soldiering. So he and two or three of his friends sent for the drill-sergeant. The drill-sergeant put them through their exercise; but he only gave them one precept, and that was this: he said to them, Mind, my lads, what you have to do is this—when you go into action you must stand like a brick wall. And that has been the great quality of the British soldier—that under all circumstances he has been ready to stand, and he has stood, like a brick wall. (Cheers.) And there was a time when standing like a brick wall was about enough to win a battle. That won't do now. War, instead of a rude contest of strength, has become one of the most highly-developed of all the arts practised by mankind: I know not whether to regret it or to rejoice in it—I only state the fact; but, instead of trusting simply to the native and sterling qualities of the country, we must now endeavour to add to these qualities every advantage that can be imparted by the most skilful and effectual training.”

The speaker then referred to the “Autumn Manceuvres,” which had taken place in Hampshire³ instead of the proposed Berkshire campaign, which had been “witnessed by most enlightened and distinguished foreign officers from every country in Europe. We have had time,” he added, “to receive back from foreign Courts the most interesting reports made to their respective Governments by these distinguished officers; and I am rejoiced to inform you that their character is most encouraging (cheers),—not only in every case do they feel an unbounded, at least a warm admiration—in order that I may avoid any thing like hyperbole,—not only do they express a warm admiration for the *matériel* both of officers and men, but in the various branches of the service, as to their efficiency, they speak in terms of the highest honour (cheers); and while, as friendly critics, they point out, as we knew they would point out, and as we hoped they would point out, the many matters in which we might further improve, they show the condition of the army, so far from justifying the ridiculous apprehensions that have gone abroad, to be one that ought to fill all England with hope and satisfaction, and to prove to us that, if it should please Providence to bring upon us the necessity, never was the country more able to entrust its defence to troops and to officers more worthy of their country, or more certain to make that defence effectual. (Loud cheers.) And, gentlemen, let me now say one word with respect to the War Minister. There has been a fashion during the present year to scoff at Mr. Cardwell. (Hear, hear.) I can only say that, when he is condemned, I, for my part, am glad to share the condemnation. (Cheers.) But I venture to affirm that no man who ever held the seals of office since the Secretaryship at War was established, has done so much for the reform and the efficiency of the army (cheers); and I am quite sure that when he retires from the office, he will leave behind a name

³ For an account of these see the “Chronicle.”

entitled to the approval and the gratitude of the country. (Loud cheers.) Well now, gentlemen, that is our justification for dealing with the question of Purchase. (Cheers.)

"Then, were we wrong in dealing with the question of Education? Has there ever been—I would venture to say even to the most jealous critic of the Education Act,—has there ever been achieved in this country so great a step in advance towards the attainment of an object which we believe to be vital to the welfare of the nation? (Cheers.) It is not all done at once; it cannot be all done at once. A great and comprehensive measure of that kind hardly can be perfect. The differences of opinion that prevail in their very nature make it quite impossible to meet the views of all. Indulgence, equity, the sacrifice of extreme opinions must be asked for in every quarter. (Cheers.) But I ask those who are least satisfied with the Education Act this one and simple question—whether it is not a great stride, and a great stride achieved upon a path of real progress? (Cheers.) I have no doubt that the question is a grave and serious question; and I will not now attempt to say more upon it than this—on the one hand we shall endeavour to adhere to that principle of the Act which aims at the severance between the application of State funds and controverted matters in religion; and on the other I must pause, for my own part, and I believe my colleagues would feel themselves obliged to pause before they could resolve to say to the parent desirous to send his child to a school of his own persuasion, compelled by public authority to send it to school, and unable to pay the charge, If you attempt to send the child to a school of your own persuasion, if you don't consent to send him to a school the principles of which you disapprove—namely, the rate school—we shall send you to prison. (Hear, hear.) I don't think public opinion would sustain us in such a course. (Cheers.)

"Well, gentlemen, with regard to the other of those great objects, the Ballot (cheers), I believe it to be your opinion that we made a good and wise choice in pressing that important question upon the attention of Parliament. (Cheers.) The enfranchisement, and the wide enfranchisement, of the working class was intended to give the boon of political power not only to the class but to every individual in that class. Now, gentlemen, I will for the present assume that as regards the class of greater subjects on which I had the honour of addressing you at the time of my election, and as regards those questions to which we have invited Parliament principally to apply itself, you may be disposed to think that we have not made an unreasonable or injudicious selection, although we had to choose from among many matters of deep interest and importance (cheers); and I will now say a word or two of the future. (Cheers.)

"There is one measure in particular, or rather one set of measures, relating to a painful subject on which I cannot here enter in detail. I mean those measures which are known by the name of the Contagious Diseases Acts. I will only assure you that they have received the close attention of the Government—that we shall

be ready when the session arrives in due course to state our views, and that, as we believe, it will then be your opinion that we have not fallen short of the care and interest which the subject demands; that we have not concealed from ourselves the difficulties that beset it; and that the modes in which we propose to deal with it may be likely to command the general approval of the intelligent community. (Cheers.) The great questions to which I have lately referred have caused us, in a considerable degree, to put aside another class of questions upon which the heart and mind of the country are strongly set.

"Now, gentlemen, there is a question of the future on which you have heard much said of late. I mean the question of the constitution of the House of Lords. [A voice—'Leave the constitution of the House of Lords alone!'] Well, I am not prepared to agree with my friend there (cheers and a laugh), because the constitution of the House of Lords has often been a subject of consideration among the wisest and most sober-minded men; as, for example, when a proposal, of which my friend disapproves, perhaps, was made a few years ago to make a moderate addition to the House of Lords of peers holding their peerages for life. (Cheers.) I am not going to discuss that particular measure; I will only say, without entering into details that would be highly interesting, but which the vast range of the subject makes impossible on the present occasion—I will only say that I believe there are various particulars in which the constitution of the House of Lords might, under favourable circumstances, be improved. (Cheers.) And I am bound to say that, though I believe there are some politicians bearing the name of Liberal who approve the proceedings of the House of Lords with respect to the Ballot Bill at the close of last session (cheers and interruption), I must own that I deeply lament that proceeding. (Cheers.) I have a shrewd suspicion in my mind that a very large proportion of the people of England have a sneaking kindness for the hereditary principle. (Cheers and laughter.) My observation has not been of a very brief period, and what I have observed is this, that wherever there is any thing to be done, or to be given, and there are two candidates for it who are exactly alike—alike in opinions, alike in character, alike in possessions, the one being a commoner and the other a lord—the Englishman is very apt indeed to prefer the lord. (A laugh.) Once on a time, about fifteen years ago, it was supposed that the Whig party was too aristocratic, too exclusive, and a popular combination of members of Parliament was formed for the purpose of making a practical protest against this supposed exclusiveness. I don't think the charge was made good; but that is immaterial. This body of members—most respectable and excellent men—organized themselves, and after they had organized themselves for the purpose of making a practical protest of this kind, there came a petition from some rather important town in favour of the object of the association. This petition, I think, was handed to some one who acted as secretary; but, at any rate,

†

the question arose among them who should present the petition on the part of the body. I believe there were about forty of these gentlemen; there was only one of them who was a lord, and these gentlemen determined that the lord should present the petition. (Cheers and laughter.) Well now, gentlemen, we have had another instance—an amusing instance—within the last few days. You have all heard of the ‘seven points.’ (Laughter.) I am not going to enter into the mysterious and mystical part of that transaction, which, I have no doubt, is destined, under the action of time, which brings all things to light, to undergo further elucidation. But there is one gentleman there is no doubt about at all, for he is in the thick of it. I believe he is a very distinguished man. Mr. Scott Russell seems to have cast his eyes around, and after surveying the whole circuit of the community, he thought he had got a secret whereby the discords of classes could be removed. So he proceeded to organize a body of working men whom he considered in some degree—great or small, I don’t say—to represent the working men on the one side, and he also organized a body to represent the other classes on the other side. Here was one body on one side, another body on the other side, and in the middle Mr. Scott Russell. (Laughter.) Mr. Scott Russell comes in communication with both of these bodies. He speaks first to the one and then to the other. (Laughter.) You have seen a clergyman in a large church when he gives out his text; he first of all looks to the people in one part of the church, and says, ‘You will find it written so-and-so,’ and then to the other side of the congregation, ‘You will find it so-and-so.’ (A laugh.) This is exactly, or almost exactly, what seems to have been done by Mr. Scott Russell. The only difference is this—that, unfortunately, Mr. Scott Russell gives a text out of one Testament to the people on this side, and a text out of the other Testament to the people on the other side. (Much laughter.) But the point to which I wish to call your attention is this,—the description—it is a very narrow and a very clear one—which Mr. Scott Russell gives to the working men of the nature and composition of the body he had organized. He might have said, I have organized a body of educated, intelligent, and independent men, and, perhaps, that would have occurred in another country. But what is the language he used? He said, I have organized this body, and what does it contain? It contains peers, lords, baronets, and one commoner (laughter)—one solitary commoner among peers, lords, and baronets. (Continued laughter.) Mr. Scott Russell must have known the dispositions of those whom he was addressing. No doubt when he leant to this side of the congregation he used the language which would be agreeable to their sympathies and feelings, and yet so it fell out that there was but one commoner in this illustrious body—like a solitary non-commissioned officer preferred from the ranks to the mess-table. (Laughter.) That is the description—it is by describing men as peers, lords, and baronets that he finds he will make his prescription most acceptable to those for whom it was

intended. Now this is all very well—I know there cannot be much force in any particular illustration with respect to a matter that can only be judged by a long course of observation; but this I do say is my own conviction—the general sentiment of the mass of the population of this country is, they think in some way or other that the people who compose the House of Lords in a very large proportion are either themselves men or the descendants of men who were put into the House of Lords for public services (cheers); and where men have been put into the House of Lords for public services they are disposed to look with considerable favour upon the descendants of such men until they have proved themselves unworthy. (Cheers.) They know, too, that in fact and not by compulsion, but by the free will of the people, this body of gentlemen called the House of Lords exercise throughout the country a vast social and political influence; and, lastly, they know, although the good ones have to carry upon their backs the responsibility of the bad, that many of them perform their duties in an admirable and exemplary manner. (Cheers.) Well, under these circumstances—and I hope while I remain in public life I shall be able to act zealously and cheerfully with you for the promotion of Liberal opinions—I for one never understood by Liberal opinions either precipitate conclusions or subversive conclusions, and I trust we shall well consider before we commit ourselves to vast changes and the introduction of new principles, and that we shall know before we commit ourselves something of what the results are likely to be.” (Cheers.)

After enumerating the advantages which the legislation of the last eighteen years had, according to his contention, secured for the working man—such as free trade, the removal of taxation to the extent of twenty millions sterling per annum, an education bill, and a cheap press—Mr. Gladstone arrived at his peroration, which he began with one of those strange examples of what, for want of a better name, must be called bad taste, from which in his best moments he seemed never safe—a quotation of some verses from what he himself styled a “questionable book,” which turned out to be a collection of blasphemous parodies on the Litany and other religious services, published in the Republican interest, under the auspices of Mr. Bradlaugh. A more effective handle he could scarcely have given to his enemies. At the time, however, his original was not recognized, and his speech concluded very happily, his argument being that whatever legislation might do, it was on Englishmen themselves that their future well-being and improvement must depend. Those who promised Utopian benefits to the working man were “quacks—deluded and beguiled by a spurious philanthropy. What we have to ask ourselves are questions which depend on ourselves individually, in the main, to answer. How are the ravages of strong drink to be arrested? (Cheers.) In an age when, from year to year, more and more women are becoming self-dependent members of the community, how, without tampering with the cardinal laws that determine providentially their position in the

world, are we to remove the serious social inequalities under which I for one think they labour? (Cheers.) How, in a country where wealth accumulates with such vast rapidity, are we to check the growth of luxury and selfishness by a sound and healthy opinion? How are we to secure to labour its due honour; I mean not only to the labour of the hands, but to the labour of the man with any and all the faculties which God has given him? (Cheers.) How are we to make ourselves believe, and how are we to bring the country to believe, that in the sight of God and man labour is honourable and idleness is contemptible? (Cheers.) Depend upon it, gentlemen, I do but speak the serious and solemn truth when I say that beneath the political questions that are found on the surface lie those deeper and more searching questions that enter into the breast and strike home to the conscience and mind of every man; and it is upon the solution of these questions that the well-being of England must depend. (Cheers.) Gentlemen, I use the words of a popular poet when I give vent to this sentiment of hope, with which for one I venture to look forward to the future of this country. He says—

“The ancient virtue is not dead, and long may it endure,
May wealth in England—”

and I am sure he means by wealth that higher sense of it, prosperity and sound prosperity—

“May wealth in England never fail, nor pity for the poor.”

(Cheers.) May strength and the means of material prosperity never be wanting to us; but it is far more important that there shall not be wanting the disposition to use those means aright. Gentlemen, I shall go from this meeting, having given you the best account of my position in my feeble power, within the time and under the circumstances of the day—I shall go from this meeting strengthened by the comfort of your kindness and your indulgence to resume my humble share in public labours. No motive will more operate upon me in stimulating me to the discharge of duty than the gratitude with which I look back upon the, I believe, unexampled circumstances under which you made me your representative. (Cheers.) But I shall endeavour—I shall make it my hope—to show that gratitude less by words of idle compliment or hollow flattery than by a manful endeavour, according to the measure of my gifts, humble as they may be, to render service to a Queen that lives in the hearts of the people (cheers), and to a nation with respect to which I will say that, through all posterity, whether it be praised or whether it be blamed, whether it be acquitted, or whether it be condemned, it will be acquitted or condemned upon this issue, of having made a good or a bad use of the most splendid opportunities; of having turned to proper account or failed to turn to account the powers, the energies, the faculties which rank the people of this little island as among the few great nations that have stamped their name and secured their fame among the greatest nations of the world.”

The story of the “seven points,” or “new social movement,” to

which the Premier so pleasantly alluded, was a curious mystery which enlivened the dull months of the year. The public were suddenly startled by the appearance of a document said to have been signed by certain Conservative peers on behalf of their order, and certain prominent working men on behalf of theirs. This document was said to result from a laudable desire to unite the upper and the working classes of the community in a legislative scheme for the amelioration of the social and political condition of the people, and embodied the seven following resolutions, which the strange allies had agreed to draw up:—

"1. To rescue the families of our workmen from the dismal lanes, crowded alleys, and unwholesome dwellings of our towns, and plant them out in the clear, where, in the middle of a garden, in a detached homestead, in wholesome air and sunshine, they may live and grow up, strong, healthy, and pure, under the influences of a well-ordered home.

"2. To enable this to be effectually carried out there, must be created a perfect organization for the self-government of counties, towns, and villages, with powers for the acquisition and disposal of land for the common good.

"3. The next condition of the well-being of the skilled workman is that a day's labour shall consist of eight hours of honest work.

"4. In addition to schools for elementary education, there shall be provided schools for practical knowledge and technical skill in the midst of their homesteads.

"5. For the moral and physical well-being of the people, places of public recreation, knowledge, and refinement shall be organized as parts of the public service.

"6. Public markets shall be erected in every town for the sale of goods in small quantities, of best quality, at wholesale price.

"7. There shall be provided a great extension of the organization of the public service, on the model of the Post Office, for the common good."

The signatories to this extraordinary document were given as consisting of:—

"The Marquis of Salisbury, the Marquis of Lorne, the Earl of Lichfield, the Earl of Carnarvon, Lord Henry Lennox, Lord John Manners, Sir John Pakington, Sir Stafford Northcote, and Mr. Gathorne Hardy, for the Conservatives. On behalf of the Council of Skilled Workmen, we have Messrs. Robert Applegarth, joiner; Daniel Guile, iron-founder; George Howell, bricklayer; J. W. Hughes, carpenter; George Potter, joiner; Lloyd Jones, fustian cutter; W. Broadhurst, mason; F. Whetstone, engineer; John Deighton, joiner; Alfred Barker, shoemaker; James Squire, painter; P. Barry, author of 'Workmen's Rights'; R. M. Latham, chairman of the Labour Representation League; Sigismund Englander, telegraphist; T. J. Dunning, bookbinder; W. Allan, (pledged by D. Guile); Joseph Leicester; and Scott Russell, engineer."

The scheme appeared to have been carried on almost entirely by

the mediation of Mr. Scott Russell, who alone had been cognisant of the names of the negotiators on either side. The suggestions came, in the first place, from a body of working men meeting under the chairmanship of Mr. Scott Russell, and the secretaryship of Mr. George Potter, and bearing the title of the Council of Skilled Workmen. On February 3 this Council empowered its chairman to enter into negotiation with some peers who were anxious to know what were the real wishes of the working men, and it was not till August 4 that he was able to make an official statement that a Council of Legislation had been formed by a number of peers and other gentlemen, and had empowered him to communicate to the Council of Skilled Workmen the following resolution:—

“The Council of Legislation for the well-being and well-doing of English skilled workmen accept the proposition made to them by Mr. Scott Russell, the President of the Council of Representative Working Men, constituted in January last. They accept the responsibility of advising with that Council regarding the legislative measures necessary to promote the physical, moral, and intellectual welfare of the working classes. They accept the responsibility of preparing those legislative measures for carrying the objects of the working men into effect, and of bringing in and passing those measures through both Houses of Parliament.”

On this extraordinary story being made public, several of the Conservative leaders denied the signing of any such document, and the “Social Alliance” became involved in much amusing mystification. Lord Salisbury admitted that the resolutions were shown to him “confidentially” in June, when he expressed a general sympathy with the aim of the resolution as to the artisans’ houses, and strong disapproval of many of the others. Sir Stafford Northcote said that all that he had heard was, “that some Peers and Members of Parliament expressed their willingness to consider any suggestion for legislation on questions affecting the well-being of the working class in a friendly spirit. No such suggestions have, however, as yet been made in a form admitting of consideration.” Lord Derby said that “he never assented to or in any way expressed approval of the ideas set forth” in the string of resolutions. Lord Carnarvon “never assented to, nor could assent to,” the resolutions in question. Mr. Gathorne Hardy was indignant at being “discredited with opinions so unlike my own.” The Marquis of Lorne had joined “no association such as that as to which” an Argyllshire elector had questioned him. The Duke of Richmond and Lord Henry Lennox had never heard of the matter.

On the other hand, Mr. P. Barry, writing himself “treasurer” (of the Social Alliance), wrote to the papers to say that Mr. Scott Russell was apparently in possession of “the signatures of the Lords,” and that he could not furnish further information, the movement being “still in progress.” Whereupon Mr. George Potter made the mystery deeper by stating that “at a meeting of

the Council held last evening, it was unanimously resolved that the Secretary be instructed to inform the Press that the communications signed 'P. Barry, Treasurer,' which have appeared in various newspapers, are wholly unauthorized."

The Peers and the working men next put in their different accounts of the different side of the shield presented to their view,—Mr. Scott Russell being the shield, of which apparently one side was inscribed with a very vague, and the other with a very definite inscription. According to the Peers, "early in the summer" Mr. Scott Russell made the first application to them, "in the name of a representative Council of working men, of which he was Chairman, expressing a wish that some leading Members of both Houses should consent to act together in considering the reasonable requirements of the working class and such legislative measures as might be proposed to them." The result was that Lords Salisbury, Carnarvon, Lichfield, John Manners, Sandon (a new name in the matter), with Sir John Pakington, Sir Stafford Northcote, and Mr. Gathorne Hardy, signed a memorandum, in which they declared that, "at the request of Mr. Scott Russell, as chairman of a Council of representative working men," they undertook "to consider in a friendly and impartial spirit whether and in what measure we can co-operate with this Council in measures calculated to remove the disadvantages which affect the well-being of the working classes;" but reserving "to ourselves the most unfettered discretion in the selection of objects and the modification or rejection of measures proposed to us for consideration."

On the other hand, the representative working men, including Mr. Howell, Mr. Applegarth, Mr. Lloyd Jones, and others, asserted that Mr. Scott Russell invited them to consider the most needful social reforms, on the ground that "certain noblemen and Members of Parliament of high position—not then named—were anxious to co-operate with working men in inaugurating and promoting a movement established to ameliorate the condition of our skilled artisans." Mr. Scott Russell seems to have kept each group sedulously in ignorance of the names of the other, and after the working men had formulated their demands in the seven celebrated articles, he informed them on the 19th of August that his "negotiations had been successful, all the objects had been attained," but that his difficulties had been enormous; that he had failed with the Liberals, and had to turn to the Tories; that he had had six months of very hard work, and that in May he had had to begin his work all over again. On the 28th September he gave the names of Lord Lichfield, Lord Carnarvon, Lord Salisbury, *Lord Lorne*, *Lord Henry Lennox*, Lord John Manners, Sir John Pakington, Sir S. Northcote, and Mr. Gathorne Hardy, as having assented to the seven propositions (so the working men were "distinctly given to understand"), of whom Lord Lorne and Lord Henry Lennox disclaimed all share in the movement, while there was no mention of Lord Sandon, who seems to have joined in the memorandum. The working men

thought it had gone so far that they were expecting Mr. Scott Russell to arrange a meeting, "at which the legislative measures were to be discussed, and the details of the Bills agreed upon." It seemed that in some way or other the working men were deceived, and even the Peers were not enlightened, by the negotiator.

When at last Mr. Scott Russell came forward with his own account to supply the missing link, the explanation was not very lucid. He addressed a letter to the two allied bodies, beginning, "My Lords, Gentlemen, and Fellow Workmen," tracing back the psychological history of his own attempt to combine Peers and working men in a work of social reform to a period anterior to 1851, and referring it to the counsels of the Prince Consort. Beyond this, and the fact that the troubles in France in 1870 and the success of Germany brought very strongly before him the advantages of a cultivated and self-respecting working class, he threw no sort of light on the movement, or the discrepancies between the impression he had given to the working men of what the Peers and Baronets were prepared to do, and the impression he had received in writing from the Peers and Baronets as to what they were prepared to do. Over that he passed altogether. He said, however, with a certain flourish of manner, "Never have I received from, or made overtures to, the leaders of either of the political parties in the State. One of the chief causes of the movement has been our utter disbelief in the wisdom, patriotism, or statesmanship of mere party politics, and our conviction that the great interests of the nation are utterly neglected while the rival parties in the House of Commons are factiously contending for the paltry purpose of keeping one of them in power and the other out."

His letter concluded with an assertion that the "imperative duty of the two Councils" remained the same as before. "I trust," he said, "my short statement has shown that this Social Movement was neither a revolutionary conspiracy nor a political manœuvre; that it was an endeavour to unite more closely in a bond of brotherly kindness some separated, if not alienated, classes of Englishmen; that it was a work dictated by patriotism, directed by common sense, reconciled with common justice, and, in short, a work of plain practical Christianity. Let us now stand fast by our principles, and go straight through with our work."

The rights of the Social Alliance thus continued a mystery, and nothing further was heard of it this year than the amusing comments which we have quoted from Mr. Gladstone's speech at Greenwich.

A new "sensation," however (to use the favourite phrase of the day), was soon provided for the public in place of the Seven Points, in the shape of a new development of Republicanism.

Sir Charles Dilke, one of the members for Chelsea, though as times go a young man, had already courted notoriety as traveller, author, and politician. In the first capacities united he had published in a

big and exhaustive work, entitled "Greater Britain," his impressions of the English-speaking peoples of the earth, as derived from a rapid tourist's view of those peoples, which, however, had enabled him to arrive intuitively at a full comprehension of all the most difficult questions, of whatever nature, which concerned all and each of them, and to enlighten slower intellects thereupon. In the Franco-German war, in company with two other Liberal members of advanced views, he had hovered on the skirts of the battles with an opera-glass and a red cross. In Parliament he had not signalized himself in any marked manner, except by voting in the most unpopular and smallest minorities of the session, on such questions as the royal dowries; and on his bringing forward a motion about the Black Sea Conference he called down on himself a smart rebuke from the Premier, which was equally relished by all sections of the House.

As the Dilke baronetcy was generally supposed to have been created for his father as a reward for assiduous and obsequious attendance on the Prince Consort, there was a special appropriateness in the appearance of Sir Charles Dilke to make a personal attack upon the Queen. The occasion chosen was the delivery of a lecture at Newcastle on "Representation and Royalty." His text was, that the positive and direct cost of royalty to this country is about a million a year. His speech, though it naturally made a sensation at the time, as coming from a baronet, need not be quoted at any length, having been as conclusive in argument, and incorrect in facts, as it was violent in expression. He believed that 100,000*l.* a year was spent on royal yachts and yachting, and 131,000*l.* on the royal household; and 172,000*l.* used to be spent on tradesmen's bills, and was now saved by the Queen—"a division of public moneys almost amounting to malversation" in Sir Charles's gracious language, though, whether to be regretted or not, the economy could not certainly differ legally from the saving effected by any other official out of his own salary. But the main charge brought by the lecturer against the Queen was, that on the introduction of the Income Tax she had undertaken to subject her own income to it, and had broken her word. It afterwards appeared that Sir Charles Dilke had based this statement solely on his knowledge that "in 1855 the Financial Reform Association, under the presidency of Mr. Robertson Gladstone, had satisfied themselves that her Majesty did not pay income tax," and had made no further inquiry before bringing this outrageous charge, which was absolutely unfounded in fact, the truth being that the Queen had paid income tax from the day of its first imposition. But Sir Charles did not think it necessary to make any admission or retraction of the error.

Equally correct was his estimate of the cost of the Royal Family—in reality, we believe about 300,000*l.* a year. But fictions are a pleasanter material than facts for lecturers of this order. The storm of indignation (of which the occasion was hardly worthy,) which followed the publication of Sir C. Dilke's lecture was louder and

more general than the most loyal could have anticipated, and even the Speaker himself (who indeed probably, like most orators of his calibre, had said a good deal more than he meant) was shamed into an unsuccessful attempt to prove that he had intended no discourtesy to the Queen.

One very curious result followed from the feeling aroused. In some places the lower classes, to whose passions and prejudices the lecturer might be supposed to have specially appealed, took up the cause of royalty with such violence that the police were called in to protect the Republicans in the free utterance of their subversive sentiments—a phenomenon which called forth much wondering and curious comment in France—and was indeed a striking tribute at once to freedom and to order. There is no doubt that some very serious riots were prevented by the measure; even as it was, one of Sir Charles Dilke's partisans lost his life in one place, and in another the great Republican apostle, Odger, barely escaped with his from an excited mob.

Meantime the national loyalty was to be put to a far graver test. The story of the dangerous illness of the Prince of Wales (whose safety can scarcely yet be held a certainty even while these words are penned,) is told in another part of this volume⁴, and need not be set down in detail here. But wonderful indeed was the effect of that illness throughout the country, unless the most clamorous signs of public feeling are to be held delusions.

When the news of the 8th of December fell like a thunderbolt upon the country, and it was known that the Prince, whom all had believed recovering, was lying in the very blackness of the valley of the shadow of death, the nation seemed to gather round the throne with a single heart and a single prayer. And not the nation only, but the farthest ends of the earth, all united in a moment by the action of the telegraph wire, which now brought about a state of things unique in history. Abroad, as at home—in India, America, Australia, in every part of the great kingdom, on which, according to the proud old boast, the sun never sets, business and pleasure were for the time suspended. Receptions at the Calcutta Government House, and Republican gatherings in London, were postponed at the self-same moment, and for the self-same cause. And for six days and nights did millions of people, each in his own tongue, and according to his own creed, "wrestle with God in prayer," hopelessly as it seemed, for that one young life. If ever prayer availed, surely that long and universal cry held back the parting soul from the very gates of death.

It will not be soon forgotten, that it was on the 14th of December, the tenth anniversary of the Prince Consort's death, which had been anticipated by many with an acknowledged dread, which showed how strangely strong, in spite of civilization and of reason, is the hold of superstition on the human mind, that the dark cloud passed

⁴ See the "Chronicle."

away, and the people breathed again. Throughout that week of suspense and fear the streets in front of the newspaper and telegraph offices were continually crowded even during the hours of the night, and the announcement of any news that gave a glimmer of hope was received with general cheering by the curious people. Every opportunity was taken for displays of loyalty and of attachment to the reigning family, which could only be enhanced by the simple patience and devotion with which its different members waited on the sick-bed.

When the anniversary of Christmas came round the public mind had been set at ease by the continuance of the favourable turn that the Prince's illness had taken, and Boxing-night at the different theatres was made the occasion of a memorable exhibition of feeling. Surely Citizen Dilke himself, if he chanced to be among the audience at Drury Lane, "could scarce forbear to cheer" when the crowded galleries and pit caught up in full chorus, three times in succession, the air "God bless the Prince of Wales," as the orchestra played it, the whole house rising to their feet.

This general revival—awakening rather—of the old-fashioned loyalty in its fullest force was the more remarkable that the Prince of Wales had been for some time growing, or supposed to be growing, very unpopular, except with those who knew him personally, and by whom he was always valued. Due allowance had perhaps not been made for the exceptional difficulties of his position, at the best difficult enough, deprived as he was of the means of keeping up that outward show of royalty which more than any thing else tends to make a prince popular with the million. And his ways and tastes had been too characteristic of the "gilded youth" of the day, to be popular in one whose smallest actions were seen under so broad a light. But all such sins were forgotten now, or only remembered to be forgiven. The great event of the closing month of 1871, which so completely absorbed the public mind that the newspapers set aside even the last crisis of the French Republic as of no account in comparison, and the *Times* for two days had leading articles on no other subject, showed at least this, that for good or for evil, the old leaven of royalty was as strong as ever in the heart of the people. Republicans and Communists, to all appearance, had failed even to shake the reverence of Englishmen for the "mystic sublimity of caste."

Among the minor matters of the moment which was forgotten, or its interest suspended, by the Prince's illness, but which must not be forgotten here, was the last ministerial difficulty of the year, which when the danger of the Prince first became known, was the theme of all the papers, and seemed fraught with more promise of mischief to Mr. Gladstone than all his previous mistakes. The danger was wantonly incurred, it would almost seem, out of sheer recklessness and confidence. It will be remembered that the Privy Council Act, passed at the close of the session, provided for the appointment of four paid members of the Judicial Committee of that

body, to consist of two Indian judges, and two judges of the superior courts. The law-officers of the Crown were not mentioned; and the inference drawn by many from the omission was not only that judicial experience was to be held a requisite for the appointment, but that the new Court of appeal was not to be made 'a new opportunity for political appointments, and to provide rewards for parliamentary supporters, as is the case, to the scandal of our law, with the highest judicial posts in England, the Lord Chancellorship and the chiefships of the Common-Law Courts. When the appointments under the new Act came to be made, which was not done until the latest possible moment, one of the Indian posts was given to Sir James Colville, and the other was not filled up at all. Sir Montague Smith was transferred from the Common Pleas to the new bench, and for the fourth place, the Attorney-General, Sir Robert Collier, was designated. To qualify him legally for the post, he was appointed to the Common Pleas for two days, and then translated—an evasion of the Government's own acts so violent and so transparent, that it aroused an immediate outcry. No fitter man personally could have been chosen for the post than Sir Robert Collier, and no particle of blame or of discredit could attach to him. He had every qualification for the place, both natural and acquired; more than that, it might well be supposed, *à priori*, that the varied knowledge and experience necessary for the new Appellate Court would be more likely to be found in a law officer of the Crown than in a puisne judge. But the language and purport of the Act were too clear to admit of reasonable doubt, and when it was known that the Lord Chief Justice Cockburn had addressed a protest to the Government on the subject, the force of adverse criticism was increased. Nor was it allayed by the publication of the correspondence relating to this protest, which will be found among the papers attached to this volume. Whether it was a dignified or proper measure in an official of Sir Alexander Cockburn's position to publish such a correspondence in the newspapers was very questionable. Whether he had any personal right whatever to take up the cudgels in behalf of the "dignity of the judicial office," as against his superior in judicial office, the Lord Chancellor, was more questionable still. And lastly, a protest which would have carried due weight if made when the intended appointment was first made known, became merely embarrassing to the Government by being deferred till the appointment of Sir R. Collier to the Common Pleas had been completed, and it was too late for the Premier to break faith with a valuable servant who had only accepted the lower office on the faith of an immediate translation to the higher. But none the less were the arguments used by the Chief Justice in his letter unanswerable; and nothing could justify the Lord Chancellor's discourtesy, or Mr. Gladstone's disingenuousness. It will be seen, by reference to the latter's letter, that he affected to understand Sir A. Cockburn's protest as made against the appointment of the Attorney-General to a seat in the Common Pleas—an affectation

which, when in the face of the clear terms of Sir A. Cockburn's letter, speaks for itself. The whole transaction, though effaced for the moment by the national anxiety for the Prince of Wales, was fraught with evil augury for the coming session.

The prevalence of strikes was one of the most dangerous features of the year; and, in this form at least, the spread of Communism was an unquestionable fact. The features of these combinations are always the same. A dispute arises between masters and men about money, or about time, and time is money. The men strike; the masters try after other men. If the freemasonry of the artisan be not too powerful, they succeed. Strangers, possibly foreigners, arrive at the empty works. What follows? Rattening, intimidation for the new comers, fire for the mill.

A strike of 9050 engineers of Newcastle was the most remarkable of the year, and illustrated best the power of the trades unions to sustain the operatives in their movement. It was a strike for 10 per cent. more pay, or rather to give 10 per cent. less work (nine hours instead of ten) for the same pay. The Nine Hours League, and other societies, not only supplied the engineers with funds during sixteen weeks of idleness, but were very influential in inducing foreign workmen to refuse offers made to them to take up their work. Nowhere was less willingness shown to submit the question to arbitration, but the engineers relied upon their combined strength, and upon the fact that the masters in Sunderland had conceded the hour. Nor was this, or strikes like this, a mere local combination. The very same spirit that moved the engineers of Newcastle moved the mechanics of the Prussian capital, and later of the Belgian capital. From the engineers of Newcastle the mania to strike actually spread to the police of the same town. The colliers of Northumberland and of Dean Forest, Gloucestershire, with the iron-workers of North Staffordshire, all turned out together. Nor were these the only bodies of men at one time on strike. There were also the dyers of Bradford, the quarrymen of Leeds, and the crate-makers of the Potteries, not to mention minor attempts to coerce employers by refusing to work.

Delegates, representing some 30,000 or 40,000 iron-workers, colliers, and miners of South Wales and Monmouthshire came to a resolution to appeal for an advance of 10 per cent. in wages. The Newcastle strike ended in a practical victory for the workmen. After various formal attempts at arbitration had been made and failed, in which Mr. Mundella was a prime mover, two informal negotiators, unauthorized by either masters or men, met together and agreed on terms which were afterwards accepted by both parties. These terms involved a formal concession of the men's demands from the 1st January, 1872, when the nine hours' day was to begin, the masters gaining the delay. Besides this, the men engaged to work overtime whenever the masters should think it necessary; but the wages for the nine hours' day were to be as high as they were for the ten hours. The agreement was to be valid for

a year, but to be determinable at the end of six months by a month's notice from either party, if either should wish to determine it. It was said that the leaving of the "overtime" in the discretion of the masters gave a great victory to the latter. But the men had, through their leader, Mr. Burnett, always expressed their wish to save the masters from serious trade difficulties by working overtime when it should really be necessary to execute important contracts, and the extra price to be paid for overtime must always be a real check on needless and arbitrary demands for it. The masters in fact promised to yield every thing, after ten weeks, which they said it was impossible for them to yield.

More practically interesting to the general public was a strike of the telegraph clerks which took place in the month of December. Manchester was the chief seat of the strike, but Liverpool, Glasgow, Dublin, Belfast, and several other large centres, were much incommoded. The circumstances of the strike were these:—

It seems that the clerks, not being contented with Government treatment, formed for themselves a sort of trade union, called the Telegraphic Association. The Post-office authorities regarded this as a means of promoting disaffection, and nine of the *employés* of the Manchester district were suspended for connexion with the society. The other clerks to some extent taking their side, 120 struck work at Manchester. The same day at Liverpool a deputation of telegraphic manipulators waited upon the postmaster and requested him to demand of Mr. Scudamore, the head of the department in London, that all the clerks who had been suspended for joining the association should be reinstated. The deputation stated that, unless the request was immediately complied with, the members of the association in Liverpool would strike. Mr. Scudamore was communicated with by telegraph, and declined to accede to the demand. About fifty telegraph manipulators then left their work, but their places were immediately filled up, partly by clerks who had been sent down from London to meet the emergency. The movement was repeated at Glasgow, where seventy clerks struck; at Dublin, 200 turned out; at Bradford, twelve; and it is calculated that about 570 in all joined the insurrection. The *Irish Times* related how, one day in Dublin, on the bell ringing from London advising the clerks at the General Post Office that important intelligence was about to be transmitted, the male *employés*, numbering about sixty, with a number of young ladies who were working in circuits, rose from their instruments *en masse*, and refused to receive or transmit messages. The female telegraphists joined the strike in Dublin. Twenty-three telegraph clerks in Edinburgh struck, but their places were filled up.

Although the terms offered by Mr. Scudamore were rejected by the body of the Manchester men at one o'clock on December 12, which closed the time of grace during which they might return to service without prejudice, several individuals had yielded. At a meeting held in the evening, a resolution to accept Mr. Scudamore's

terms, if the men could be received upon that condition, was carried by about fifty votes against a dozen, the members of the Executive Committee, whose suspension was the proximate cause of the strike, remaining neutral. A deputation then waited upon the postmaster, who replied that he could now only deal with individual applications for return to service, but he would accept as many as were willing to resign their connexion with the association. These terms, after some discussion, were accepted. All the clerks who remained on strike after one o'clock were served with written notices of dismissal in the course of the afternoon. The strike at Dublin also terminated, the men having agreed to sign a paper expressing their regret at having joined in the movement.

More general uneasiness, however, was caused by this strike than by any that had occurred, and the general anxiety for some definite means of meeting and forestalling the danger of these combinations was much and sensibly increased. The constitution of some powerful Court of Arbitration was the measure that found most favour with those conversant with the difficulties of the subject ; but the prospect of such a court seemed as far off as ever when the year closed.

CHAPTER V.

The Colonies—Fenians at the Red River Settlement—Australia—Declaration respecting the Rights of the Colonies—British India—The Mussulman Population
 * —The Wahabees—Hostilities with the Tribes—The Murder of Chief Justice Norman—Home Affairs—The School Boards and Education—Contagious Diseases Acts—Report of the Commission—The Census in Parliamentary Boroughs—The Money Market during the Year—Trade and Joint Stock Speculation—Mining and other Companies—Public Securities—Commerce—Increase in Imported Food—Differences in the Church—The Voysey and Purchas Judgments—The Archbishop's Letter—Dr. Magee—The Tichborne Trial—Retirement of the Speaker—Mr. Brand—Mr. Childers at Pontefract—Peaceful Close of the Year—The Queen's Letter.

THE year 1871 passed without the occurrence of any events of active importance in the colonial dependencies of our Empire. The peace of the interior of the Canadian dominion was once more, but slightly, disturbed by an idle attempt of some Fenian agitators to excite the population of the Red River Settlement, now the territory of "Manitoba," in which the revolt of Niel and his confederates took place in 1870. They crossed the frontier from the American State of Minnesota, but seem to have exhibited no eager appetite for fighting, and were easily induced to surrender to a small force of United States' troops which followed them. The leaders were brought before the State authorities, but released, on the ground (which certainly appears obvious enough) that the acts alleged against them took place out of American jurisdiction, and were not (we conclude) within the provisions of extradition law.

The Australian colonies had for some years been feeling their way (through the action of some of their ablest and most energetic citizens) towards a federation, if not political, at least for commercial purposes. But this arrangement, which promises so many advantages, has hitherto been prevented by intercolonial difficulties. An approach towards it was made this year, in connexion with the dissatisfaction felt with certain provisions of our Treaty with the Zollverein, and with some expressions in a despatch of Lord Kimberley in relation thereto, which deserves record as having produced an expression of sentiment respecting the rights of the colonies to maintain their own tariffs, irrespective of any commercial treaties entered into by the mother country; and, farther, of the right of the colonies to impose any duties they think fit on British or other goods "not being differential;" that is, as appears from the contexts, not differential as against *foreign* countries.

"The Memorandum on the subject of Lord Kimberley's Despatch, as agreed to by the Delegates from New South Wales, Tasmania, and South Australia."

"We are of opinion that the right of the Legislatures of these colonies to direct and control their fiscal policy, as among themselves, without interference on the part of her Majesty's Ministers in England, is a right which it is our duty to assert and maintain.

"We desire that the connexion between the mother country and her offspring in this part of the world should long continue, and we emphatically repudiate all sympathy with the views of those who, in the Imperial Parliament and elsewhere, have expressed a wish that the bonds which unite us should be severed.

"As members of the British Empire, the relations of which with other countries are conducted by the Imperial Government, we deny that any Treaty can be properly or constitutionally made which directly or indirectly treats these colonies as foreign communities.

"With the internal arrangement of the Empire, whether in its central or more remote localities, foreign countries can have no pretence to interfere, and stipulations respecting the trade of one part of the Empire with another, whether by land or sea, are not stipulations which foreign Governments ought to be allowed to become parties to in any way. . . .

"We all agree that efforts should be made in our respective Legislatures to provide at as early a period as practicable, for this mutual freedom of trade; but we at the same time assert the right of the colonies we respectively represent to impose such duties on imports from other places, not being differential, as the colony may think fit."

"The Resolutions in reference to Intercolonial Tariffs as agreed to by the Delegates from New South Wales, Tasmania, South Australia, and Victoria."

"The Delegates from the Governments of New South Wales,

Tasmania, South Australia, and Victoria, in conference assembled, having had under their consideration Lord Kimberley's circular despatch of the 13th of July, 1871, have unanimously adopted the following resolutions:—

"1. That the Australian colonies claim to enter into arrangements with each other, through their respective Legislatures, so as to provide for the reciprocal admission of their respective products and manufactures, either duty free, or on such terms as may be mutually agreed upon.

"2. That no Treaty entered into by the Imperial Government with any foreign Power should in any way limit or impede the exercise of such right.

"3. That Imperial interference with intercolonial fiscal legislation should finally and absolutely cease.

"4. That so much of an Act or Acts of the Imperial Parliament as may be considered to prohibit the full exercise of such right should be repealed.

"5. That these resolutions, together with a memorandum from each Government, or a joint memorandum from such Governments as prefer to adopt that method, shall be transmitted to the Secretary of State through the Governors of our colonies respectively.

"Signed at Melbourne this 27th day of September, A.D. 1871.

"JAMES MARTIN, Attorney-General and Premier,	} New South Wales.
"GEORGE W. LORD, Colonial Treasurer,	
"JOSEPH DOCKER, Postmaster-General,	
"J. M. WILSON, Colonial Secretary and Premier,	} Tasmania.
"JAMES DUNN, M.L.C.,	
"JOHN HART, Treasurer and Premier,	} South Australia.
"WILLIAM MILNE, Chief Secretary,	
"W. MORGAN, M.L.C.,	
"C. GAVAN DUFF, Chief Secretary and Premier,	} Victoria.
"GRAHAM BERRY, Treasurer and Commissioner of Customs."	

In British India no events occurred of a nature to disturb the general peace of society and the steady progress of material improvement by public works. The troublesome predatory inroads of the Looshais, a wild tribe or collection of tribes inhabiting the forest country bordering on Assam, occasioned the only frontier disturbance; but these were of sufficient importance to require in the latter end of the year an expedition of British forces, respecting which no complete information has as yet been obtained.

But in the absence of actual disaster the public mind of India, and of those at home who take an interest in Indian affairs, was a good deal agitated by discussion respecting the disposition of the Mussulman population of that country towards its Government. Out of the total number of 150,000,000 who inhabit

British India (omitting the protected territories) about 25,000,000 are Mahometans. They are scattered in very unequal proportions over the surface of the country, most numerous in the extreme north-west, in Oude and other northern wealthy provinces, in parts of Bengal, and in particular districts of the south long under Mahometan rule: generally, it may be said, in the most advanced districts, which still contain indications of the wealth and power attained by members of the conquering faith in the times when they held the great peninsula in subjection.

"To this day," says Mr. Hunter, the author of a very remarkable essay on "Our Indian Mussulmans," "the peasantry of the Delta of the Ganges is Mahometan. Interspersed among these rural masses are landed houses of ancient pedigree and of great influence. Indeed, the remains of a once powerful and grasping Mussulman aristocracy dot the whole province, visible monuments of their departed greatness. At Murshedabad a Mohammedan Court still plays its farce of mimic state, and in every district the descendant of some line of princes sullenly and proudly eats his heart out among roofless palaces and weed-choked tanks."

When the English became masters of Bengal they found the Mahometans, so to speak, in possession. The new conquerors regarded them as paramount; the Hindoos, or Gentoos, as they were then called, as a secondary or subordinate body. So much was this the case, that when Warren Hastings had leisure to turn his mind to the subject of education and other civil wants, he recorded a minute (to quote the words of Mr. Nassau Lees, late Principal of the College of which he speaks) "in which he declared that learning was disappearing from the land, and that, as the Government considered it expedient to retain the civil administration of the country in the hands of the Mussulmans, an institution for their education should be established. With this view he founded the Mahometan College of Calcutta." But, once deprived of their supremacy as conquerors, the Moslems, both of Bengal and other parts of India, dwindled in importance; the subordinate races began to assume a position more in accordance with their numerical superiority. The system of education at Calcutta (to be mentioned only as an instance of the general change) was to a certain extent Anglicised and reduced, "as regards the upper classes in Bengal, ostensibly to little more than the substitution of the Hindoo College with an English education for Hindoos, for the Mahometan College with a Mussulman education for the followers of Islam." The system of competitive examination, under which native candidates are now mainly introduced to civil employment, is said in addition to militate (speaking still chiefly of Bengal, the most opulent of Indian provinces) against the interests of the Mahometans; a prouder, perhaps more indolent race, outstripped by the active, ambitious, and pliable youth of the Hindoo races. But this and other alleged causes of dissatisfaction felt by the descendants of the *quondam* conquerors in a land where British rule has now enforced equality, must

be left as a matter of inquiry too detailed for our purpose. Most valuable information respecting it will be found in the volume of Mr. Hunter to which we have alluded, and the controversial correspondence which it has provoked.

Much has also been said on a very curious branch of the subject—the position of Mahometan true believers, and their own notions respecting that position, under an Infidel Government. The letter of the Koran, as is well known, recognizes no such position, and admits of no compromise between the supremacy of Islam and its exclusion. But the severe and unsocial tenets of every faith are gradually modified by necessity. The following is an abstract of the account given by Mr. Nassau Lees of a convention between himself and the Sheikh-ul-Islam of Egypt on this subject:—

“The inference to be drawn from the Sheikh’s arguments, whether based on the Koran or the Canons, and which I believe to be the accepted rule, is that under a strong, just, and liberal Christian Government—i. e. a Government under which perfect civil and religious freedom is allowed—a Mohammedan may be as true and loyal to his Sovereign, though a Christian, as any of his Christian subjects, and not infringe the law; although, should the Government be weak, he would be bound to aid any Mohammedan movement which he had sound reason to believe was sufficiently powerful to overthrow the existing Government and set up a Mohammedan Government in its stead. Should it be strong and oppressive, it would then be his duty to leave the country. And that this doctrine, I may add, although not having the force of law, would be the rule and practice with Christians or the followers of any religion under the sun, who should find themselves under the Government of an alien race, we have had abundant proof in Europe. This is the law. But there are sects in India, as there are in other parts of the East, who do not recognize the doctrines or the law of the orthodox Moslim; and who, even under Mohammedan Governments, would give endless trouble if not kept in order.”

A habit has prevailed, rather popular than accurate, of comprising these sects of malcontents under the general name of Wahabees or Wahabites. The sect founded by Abd-ul-Wahab is confined almost wholly to Arabia, where it has carried out on a great scale its schemes of religious reforms and military aggrandizement. It now governs the province of Nejd, and has a strong hold on many adjoining districts. But we are not aware that either the Wahabees as a body, or any of their distinguished leaders, have evinced any tendency to prosecute their schemes beyond the Arabian peninsula, or to interfere with the loyalty of our Indian population. Such projects would seem rather at variance with the general scope of their policy. In fact, the name of Wahabi, like that of Puritan or Jesuit, seems to have become rather the indication of a class of sentiments and habits of thought than an accurate designation of a body of men combined for practical purposes.

However this may be, it is certain that our Indian malcontents

have a strong and fanatical body of allies in the mountain region beyond our jurisdiction, on the north-western frontier of the Punjab. For some years past hostilities have been at intervals carried on between ourselves and some of the warlike tribes in that quarter, headed by supposed enthusiast leaders, possessing spiritual supremacy, of whom much has been said but little discovered. It is now well known that ever since the mutiny communication has been carried on between the leaders and the heads of the disaffected party in Bengal, particularly at Patna and at Calcutta. Recent trials of some of the leaders in these treasonable schemes, especially in the former city, have laid bare a series of intrigues, with very wide ramifications, implicating, no doubt, only a small, but an active, class of religionists: and a very sad event has occurred to draw public attention to this quarter of danger. In September 1871 the Acting Chief Justice of the High Court of Calcutta, Sir Charles Norman, was murdered by a native when just about to enter his Court. The assassin was apprehended, and shortly afterwards executed. He was a Mussulman, reported of ascetic life and habits. Whether he was actuated by some private motive, or by a sudden impulse of fanaticism, or regarded the Judge as an enemy to the faith by reason of certain judicial acts which he had performed in relation to the trial of the Patna conspirators, or whether he was actually made the instrument of murder by a knot of conspirators, have been questions of much dispute, and of which no solution has as yet been found, or at least publicly given. There are evidently dangers against which it is necessary to be prepared. But it is satisfactory to find that the general tone of the Mussulman public, so far as made known to us through the more educated class, is vehement in condemnation of the alleged practices of the sect, and in assertion of content with the general principles of Indian Government, even while maintaining the existence of certain asserted grievances.

Turning again to our own country, this year will long be marked as the date at which a great scheme of National Education was set at work in England. The establishment of nearly 300 School Boards is a social fact which will tell with irresistible force on coming times. In most of the large towns of England it is now the law that school teaching shall be provided for every child, and that every parent shall send his child to school. Even in the rural districts the education of the poor has received an impulse which will extend it to classes who have not before been reached. The means of secondary education are also being extended by the reform of the Grammar Schools, while the year leaves the Universities really open to the nation. The foundation is thus firmly laid for a system of education which shall throw open the career of learning to all who have the courage to enter on it, and remove "poverty's unconquerable bar" from the path of knowledge.

But in the administration both of the Education Act and of the Endowed Schools Act great and general discontent was excited,

and something more than a coolness arose between the Government and a large part of its supporters. The closing year threatened more trouble to the Government from the clauses of the Education Bill allowing of aid to Denominational Schools than from any other source, Mr. Dixon, supported by a powerful body of Nonconformists, assuming the lead of the agitation against them. The object of excluding religious teaching from day-schools was pursued with fanatical earnestness by a section of the Liberal party; the Nonconformists, and those Liberals who politically sympathize with them, complaining that both the Grammar Schools and the Elementary Schools are being given over to ecclesiastical predominance. Whether the charge be true or not, or whether this predominance be unavoidable or not, it caused serious disaffection. In the School Board elections at Merthyr, Halifax, Dewsbury, Wolverhampton, and Stafford, the first four places elected the strongest opponents of denominationalism, while in the latter the denominationalist was returned by a very narrow majority. In these elections, too, the old principle of a simple majority was acted on, the cumulative vote not coming into use. In this matter, therefore, the year developed and left behind it a difference of opinion between the great Liberal constituencies and the Government. But the country, bearing the facts in mind, was not likely to agree with Sir Charles Dilke in saying that "one might suppose that the Education Department was presided over by the powers of darkness, instead of by good men like Sir Francis Sandford and Mr. Forster."

The vexed and painful question of the Contagious Diseases Acts, of which we have already spoken in the first chapter of this history, continued throughout the year to occupy a prominent position in the public mind, the opposition to them gaining more apparent strength.

The Acts of 1864, 1866, and 1869, for the prevention of the spread of contagious diseases, had passed through Parliament without attracting much notice. The two former were regarded as measures of sanitary police for the benefit of the Army and Navy; the last provided for extending the operation of the Acts to any locality, the inhabitants of which should make application to that effect and provide adequate hospital accommodation. An active and influential organization was arrayed against the Acts in 1869. The House of Commons was moved to repeal them, and a Royal Commission was appointed to inquire into their operation. The Report of this Commission was issued this year. No less than eighty witnesses were examined, and the Commission permitted the presence at their meetings of representatives of the two societies which had been formed for the purposes respectively of extending and of repealing the Acts. These gentlemen had the opportunity of watching the proceedings and of suggesting witnesses to be examined. The Report noticed, at the outset, the means adopted by some of the opponents of the Acts to bring them into public odium

by making charges of misconduct against the police in putting the law in force. The Commissioners made inquiry into every case in which names and details were given. In some cases the persons who publicly made these statements refused to come forward to substantiate them; in others the explanations were hearsay, or more or less frivolous. The result was to satisfy the Commissioners that the police were not chargeable with any abuse of their authority, and that they had discharged a novel and difficult duty with moderation and caution. With regard to the evil to be dealt with, the Commissioners received much evidence. They found that improved treatment had of late years mitigated the virulence of the disease to which these Acts of Parliament relate, and the more cleanly habits of the people may have diminished its prevalence; but it was shown on the highest authority that it remained a *maladie* of a most formidable description—the source of many diseases formerly referred to other origins, infecting innocent persons, and causing a number of children to be born quite unfit for the work of life. The medical evidence was general in favour of the Acts among the officers of the Army and Navy. Among the witnesses summoned at the instance of the Association for the repeal of the Acts there was no medical officer of either service. Were the physical aspect of the question alone to be considered, the Commissioners reported that they would feel it their duty to recommend the extension of the enactments to the general population, or at least to the large towns. But an inquiry into the moral and political bearing of the Acts introduced considerations of more doubt and difficulty, though the diminution of the number of women practising public solicitation in the protected districts was a material gain to public decency and morality.

It was objected that the result of the Acts was to permit immorality without attendant hazard; on the other hand, it was urged that it is the duty of the State to maintain the Army and the Navy in the highest possible state of physical efficiency, and that camps and seaports are so especially the resorts of a dangerous class as to justify exceptional regulations, strictly guarded. The principal objection, however, seemed to be to the periodical examination, which is the most efficacious means of controlling disease. The Commissioners considered that it would be difficult, if not practically impossible, to make this system general throughout the country, even if it were desirable to do so, and that to confine to a few favoured places the remedy for a disease which is general would not be possible. They were, therefore, brought to the question whether these Acts should be repealed, or whether some modification of them might not be recommended by which they might be stripped of their anomalous and offensive character without materially impairing their efficiency.

The Commissioners thought that such modification might be arrived at. There was evidence that the Act of 1864, if allowed fair play, could work with vigour and efficiency. It applied to

certain naval and military stations, and dealt only with disease. No proceedings were taken unless there was evidence to satisfy a magistrate, upon the information of a superior officer of police, that the woman was a fit subject for medical examination; and no woman could be detained in a certified hospital except by a magistrate's order founded on the certificate of the medical officer that she had a contagious disease. The evidence showed to the Commission that the women were willing to submit to treatment when disabled by disease, but that under a voluntary system they would leave the hospital upon temptation from without or even from mere weariness of confinement. The Commissioners stated their views as follows:—

“Many of the witnesses before the Commission, who upon various grounds, but always upon those of its alleged grossness and immorality, have expressed the strongest repugnance to the periodical examination of public women as practised under the Act of 1866, are, nevertheless, agreed that the detention of the women in the hospital for the completion of their cure is justifiable. It would be, indeed, to little purpose to provide hospital accommodation if they were to resort to them and to leave them at their pleasure. As regards voluntary applicants, there could be no objection to the patients being required to enter into an engagement to remain until discharged by the hospital authorities. We are assured, however, that few women would enter under such a condition; and it is urged that the liberty of the subject is invaded when a diseased prostitute is prevented from propagating disease, and compelled to enter a hospital for the purpose of being cured. We think, however, the temporary suspension of personal freedom in this instance, such suspension being strictly measured by the time required to effect the patient's cure, and accompanied by no restraint unnecessary for such purpose, is not to be regarded as an infringement of a great constitutional principle. The periodical examination being abolished we would return to the proceedings taken under the Act of 1864, which dealt directly with the disease. We would continue in existence the certified hospitals already established, preserving carefully the provisions made for the religious and moral treatment of the patients, but we would regulate the dealing with prostitutes sent compulsorily to such hospitals according to the provisions (with some modifications) to render them consistent with the control of the local authorities) of sections 11—21 of that Act; and we would permit the said provisions to be extended to any town in the United Kingdom which should make requests for such extension, and should provide proper hospital accommodation for the reception of patients. The Acts of 1866 and 1869, with the exception of the sections relating to periodical examination, and with certain other exceptions hereinafter mentioned, should continue in force within the prescribed limits, and at any military camps which may be temporarily formed, as measures of sanitary police applicable to the Army and Navy.”

The Commissioners would not allow any one to be detained in an hospital for more than three months. They would transfer the administration of the Acts from the Admiralty and War Office to the Home Department, and require the police employed to perform their duty in uniform. Stringent provisions were proposed against the use of public-houses and common lodging-houses for immoral purposes. There are provisions in existing Acts for the committal of women behaving in public in a riotous or indecent manner, or importuning and annoying passengers; and the Commissioners recommended that these clauses be strictly enforced, and that every person convicted under them be examined, and, if necessary, detained in a hospital for cure. Another recommendation made was that girls under sixteen brought up under the Vagrant Act, or found pursuing an immoral life, should be sent to a home or industrial school, if they could not be otherwise provided for to the satisfaction of a magistrate. In regard to the metropolis, the Commissioners observed that the garrison of London consists of more than 7000 men, and that they consort with a class of women described by a police surgeon as the "shame of humanity." It was suggested that until arrangements could be matured for comprehending the metropolis in general within measures to be applied to the population as a whole, aid should be given from the public funds to Lock hospitals, or hospitals having Lock wards, and that women admitted should be required to remain for the requisite period not exceeding three months. The Commissioners said,—

"The offenders who bring this affliction upon themselves by their own vicious indulgence may have no claim to the compassionate care of the State, but the numerous innocent persons who suffer from the disease are surely entitled to consideration. We venture to express our hope, therefore, that while due consideration is paid to the sentiments of the people in regard to prostitution, no misapprehension as to the real moral bearings of the question and no want of courage will be suffered to prevent the application of such remedy as may be practicable to this great evil. The firmness of a former Parliament withstood the storm of clamour with which the discovery of vaccination was assailed by the ignorance and prejudice of the day, and relieved posterity from a scourge which was the terror of earlier generations; and we would fain hope that an attempt to stay the progress of a plague scarcely less formidable in its ravages is not to be hastily abandoned."

The Commission was large, and the Report had twenty-three signatures. Sixteen of those who signed it recorded their dissent from some part or other of it; seven of these were of opinion that it did not go far enough in its proposed legislation against the evil to be met. They desired to see the Acts of 1866 and 1869 maintained in substance and in principle with some details corrected, and gradually and cautiously extended as circumstances might render possible and advisable.

The Preliminary Report of the Census of England and Wales in

1871, with a view to the increase or decrease of population in the several areas by which Members are returned to Parliament, established some facts of interest. From this it appeared that the increase was almost equally divided between boroughs and counties, or divisions of counties, excluding the boroughs which they contain. The total increase of population having been 2,637,884, we find 1,441,393 of this increase within, and 1,196,491 without the boundaries of Parliamentary boroughs. Of the 95 counties or divisions of counties the population had increased in 83, leaving a decrease, which amounts in the aggregate to 25,071, in the remaining twelve. Of this decrease, 9755, or more than one-third, occurred in the three Welsh counties of Pembrokeshire, Anglesea, and Brecon; and the remainder in East Cheshire, East and West Cornwall, East Cumberland, North Devon, Huntingdonshire, West Norfolk, South Notts, and South Wilts. The greatest diminution in any English division was 6145 in West Cornwall; and the least 496 in North Devon. The tables do not at once show whether the decrease of population in these counties or divisions occurred in or beyond their contained Parliamentary boroughs; but on investigation it seems to have been chiefly external to the borough boundaries. The exceptions are that Haverfordwest accounted for 355 out of a total diminution of 4342 in Pembrokeshire; that Liskeard and St. Ives accounted for 329 out of a diminution of 7292 in Cornwall; Macclesfield and Stockport for 2210 out of 2873 in East Cheshire; and Tavistock and Tiverton for 1559, which exceeded by 1063 the total diminution of North Devon, so that in this division the loss in these two boroughs was to a large extent retrieved by gain elsewhere. South Shropshire shows the smallest increase of any division, amounting only to eight persons; and the large increments were mostly in the divisions that contain great towns. Middlesex heads the list with 332,397, and is followed by South-East Lancashire with 160,680; by North Durham with 100,145; by the northern division of the West Riding with 89,920; and by East Surrey with 56,312.

If we turn now to the boroughs, we find that, out of the 200 which returned Members at the last general election, 158 increased their population by the already-stated aggregate of 1,441,393. Eleven boroughs had been created since the Census of 1861; so that for them no comparison with the past could be made. Thirty lost an aggregate of 54,684 persons; and one, the remarkable case of Cockermouth, had remained stationary. In four boroughs the increase was less than 100; in 29 more than 100 and less than 500; in 13 between 500 and 1000; in 23 between 1000 and 2000; in 11 between 2000 and 3000; in 8 between 3000 and 4000; in 6 between 4000 and 5000; in 14 between 5000 and 7500; in 7 between 7500 and 10,000; in 9 between 10,000 and 15,000; in 11 between 15,000 and 20,000; in 12 between 20,000 and 30,000; in 3 between 30,000 and 40,000; in 3 between 40,000 and 50,000; in 4 between 50,000 and 60,000; and in one (Lambeth) it was 84,229. The

other end of the scale is occupied by Stamford, with an increase of 39 only.

Sixty-eight boroughs had undergone alterations of boundary (probably in every case in the direction of enlargement), and sixty-six of these were among the number which show increase. In two of these cases—Ashton-under-Lyne and Cardigan—the increase was probably entirely due to the alteration of boundary, for the municipal boroughs of the same names showed a diminution, in the former case of 3856, in the latter of 8. Only two boroughs—Coventry and Macclesfield—had lost in population, notwithstanding the change of boundary. In the former the decrease was 297, in the latter 530.

Of the total decrease in borough population, about two-thirds, or 37,331, was in the City of London, and more than another sixth, or 8210, in Westminster. In these places, of course, diminution of population means the constantly-increasing appropriation of houses to business purposes instead of to residence, and the consequent migration of the former occupiers to suburban or country districts. In the remaining 28 boroughs the total decrease was only 9130, or an average of 326 in each, and this average was very little departed from. Malmesbury, with a loss of 1 person only, and Liskeard, with 10, were at one end of the scale; Stockport, with 1680, and Tavistock, with 1137, were at the other. Between these extremes there was a loss of between 500 and 600 in 1 borough, between 400 and 500 in 2, between 300 and 400 in 9, between 200 and 300 in 1, between 100 and 200 in 3, of 100 precisely in 1, and less than 100 in 7.

As far as the decrease is concerned, therefore, it was altogether too small to make any appreciable difference with regard to Parliamentary representation, but the much larger and more important question of increase requires to be considered from this point of view. The borough of Lambeth in 1861 had a population of 294,883, and in 1864 had 25,037 electors on the register, or $8\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the inhabitants. The population is now 379,112, and at the general election of 1868 there were 33,337 electors on the register, or 8·7 per cent. of the inhabitants; so that in this borough the Reform Bill has scarcely at all increased the proportion of voters to population. Next to Lambeth the four boroughs with the greatest increase of population proved to be Finsbury, the Tower Hamlets, Sheffield, and Leeds. In 1861 they had an aggregate population of 1,116,308, and in 1864 an aggregate of 72,082 electors, or 6·4 per cent. The aggregate population was now 1,334,032, and in 1868 the aggregate number of electors was 129,822, or 9·8 per cent. In these places, therefore, the proportion of electors to population was half as great again as formerly. If we separate them into two pairs, the proportionate increase of electors was much greater in the provincial than in the metropolitan boroughs, showing that in the latter there were many more persons to be enfranchised by the Reform Bill. Thus Finsbury and the

Tower Hamlets in 1861 had 723,971 inhabitants, and in 1864 they had 55,357 electors, or 7·6 per cent. In 1871 they had 834,884 population, and in 1868 64,308 electors, or 7·7 per cent. Leeds and Sheffield, on the other hand, had in 1861 a population of 392,337, and in 1864 16,726 electors. In 1871 they had 499,148 inhabitants, and in 1868 they had 65,514 electors, an increase of the latter from just over 4 to 13 per cent. of the population. In Cocker-mouth, where the number of the inhabitants remained unchanged, the voters increased from 398 in 1864 to 1095 in 1868, or from 5·7 to 15·5 per cent. of the population. It would seem from these examples as if the great increase in borough populations had been chiefly in the class of non-electors, and would tend to neutralize the recent enlargement of the franchise.

Among the odd coincidences which always come to the surface in a Census, it may be noticed how much certain initial letters prevailed among the boroughs that had lost population, although these letters did not preponderate in the whole number. There were 21 boroughs whose name commenced with W, and seven of these showed a diminution in the numbers of their inhabitants; while out of 25 commencing with B, only 4 had lost in numbers. Out of the 26 commencing with the letters A, F, G, I, N, O, and Y, none showed any diminution, and only 3 were diminished out of 21 commencing with S. These seem to be mere coincidences, unconnected with any tendency to the use of certain initials in particular districts of the kingdom.

The principal fluctuations in the Money-Market during 1870 had been directly caused by the war between France and Germany, the occurrence of which disturbed the most careful reckonings, while its successive incidents one after another falsified the most confident forecasts. The part which war played in 1870 fell in the next year to the share of peace, the arrangement of all matters of dispute between the two contending Powers having produced an effect scarcely less decided than that which had followed the first indication of an open rupture. This result is to be explained, partly by the terms of the Treaty of Peace, and partly by the internal convulsions which throughout France at once succeeded to the settlement with the foreign enemy. By the Treaty of Versailles a sum of money, unexampled in amount, was made payable to the victorious Power, and the attempts of France to raise that indemnity affected every European money-market. The revolt of the Commune, with the second siege of Paris, had also the effect of prolonging the era of distrust which had commenced with the war, and hence a large amount of French capital, which had been transmitted to England for safety in the summer of 1870, remained here for months after peace was nominally restored. These circumstances together explain the anomalous state of the Money-Market within the latter months of the closing year, and help to reconcile the widely various conjectures that were hazarded. The unprecedented movements of specie and securities that occurred after the clauses of the Treaty came into

operation had less effect here than was expected, because the influx of foreign capital provided us with exceptional means to meet our share of the liabilities involved, while, for the same reason, no sooner had the first payments been completed than our Money-Market began again to display an abundance of unemployed capital, beyond even the requirements of the very active trade then in progress. Whatever sums we wanted to advance on French account we had no difficulty in supplying, because the French themselves had deposited with us a very considerable sum, which, under more favourable political conditions, would have gone to develop business in France itself. But, even with this assistance, the first transfers of money rendered necessary by drafts in favour of Germany were heavy enough to throw the London market into temporary confusion, and to bring about a panic on the Stock Exchange. The great French Loan of 80,000,000*l.* was brought out on the 26th of June, and a number of payments, representing, it was believed, a total of about 10,000,000*l.*, fell due here in the following month. The proceeds of the drafts on London were taken by Germany in gold, and the consequence was, that, in addition to large purchases in the open market, fully 5,000,000*l.* in sovereigns left the Bank of England, in sums varying from a quarter of a million to almost a million sterling at a time. The Bank Directors took prompt steps to meet the emergency. From 2 per cent.—the figure to which previous inactivity and the accumulation of imported capital had reduced the official minimum—the rate of discount was advanced by rapid movements to 5 per cent.; the first change, from 2 to 3 per cent., being on the 21st September; and the last, from 4 to 5 per cent., being on Saturday, the 7th of October. But it was not till the last balance of the indemnity drafts had been sent off, and the enhanced rates had been some weeks in operation, that the bullion tide began to turn. On the 11th of October the stock in the Bank vaults had fallen to 19,172,898*l.* After that date the recovery was decided, and it was largely aided by the policy of the Directors, who, prudently regulating their conduct by the actual situation rather than by precedents which had no relevancy, maintained the rate of discount at a high figure some time after, to superficial observers, the necessity had ceased. The wisdom of this conduct was amply justified by the event: the resources of the establishment were swollen from week to week until the previous drain had been replaced. Then, when gold to the value of five millions sterling had been attracted from the Continent, the rate was promptly reduced in three different movements, until the minimum was 3 per cent., at which it stood when the year closed. The Bank was then in a very strong position; its reserve of notes being 14,681,225*l.*, its total bullion 24,914,822*l.*, and its proportion of reserve to liabilities exactly 50 per cent.

The Loans raised within the year were nominally of considerable magnitude. The French Loan was for 80,000,000*l.*, and it was largely subscribed here, though much of the amount must afterwards

have passed from English into French hands. The other principal issues were a Russian Loan for 12,000,000*l.* early in the year; one for 3,000,000*l.* to Brazil; an Argentine Loan for 6,000,000*l.*; two for Spain, one on the security of the Public Lands for 2,620,000*l.*, and a Three per Cent. issue for 6,375,000*l.* effective; one for Turkey to the amount of 5,700,000*l.*; and various smaller issues for the South American Republics and for our own Colonies.

Trade was extremely animated during the latter half of the year, and the profits thus acquired, in conjunction with an easy money-market, stimulated the growth of joint-stock speculation. Its development was most marked in the mining world. Mining companies to work properties in all parts of the world, and with many millions of capital, started up with bewildering rapidity. Cornwall was famous for its tin before Cæsar conquered Britain, and it maintains its ancient reputation to-day. Thus we find the West Polbreen Tin Mining Company having its property in the parish of St. Agnes; capital 7500*l.*, in shares of 3*l.* each. The Gobbett Tin Mining Company in Dartmoor had a capital of 15,000*l.*, in 3000 shares. On the last undertaking it was stated that a profit of 4800*l.* per annum might be looked for. But it was not at home that mining speculators found their most congenial field. The Pinto Silver Mining Company, Limited, with a capital of 130,000*l.* in 5*l.* shares, had for its object to work the Maryland, Top, Delaware, and Tunnell Mines, in the Pinto district of Nevada, the purchase price being 100,000*l.*, of which 40,000*l.* was in deferred shares. The East Sheboyen Silver Mining Company, capital 75,000*l.*, in 37,500 shares, of which only 5000*l.* bearing 20 per cent. interest were put in the market, the balance being taken by the vendors; this mine also belongs to Nevada, and is indeed close to Eberhard South Aurora Mines—the success of which might well form a tempting bait. Near this same Eldorado stands the property of the Great Western Silver Mining Company, with a capital of 30,000*l.*, out of which 20,000*l.* was to be paid for the mine, leaving only 10,000*l.* for working. Belonging to the same region were the Colorado United Gold and Silver Mining Company, Limited, the Peltsbury Gold Mining Company, the Toiyabe Silver Mining Company and the Mineral Silver Mining Company.

Railways were scarcely behind mines in activity, while of miscellaneous companies the most remarkable form of speculation was in tramways, now making their way, in spite of opposition, in every part of the kingdom. The London Tramways Company declared, early in the year, a maximum dividend of 6 per cent. At Scarborough we find the Scarborough Sub-Tramway Aquarium and Improvement Company for constructing a tramway between North and South Bay, running in a tunnel of 660 yards through the height by which these frequented localities are now separated. We have the Argentine Tramways Company, with a capital of 250,000*l.*, for buying up certain tramways in Buenos Ayres; and side by side with it the Buenos Ayres National Tramways Company, Limited,

with a capital of 140,000*l*. Then come the Birmingham and District Tramways Company, capital 130,000*l*.; the British and Foreign Tramways Company, with 500,000*l*. capital; the Dublin Tramways Company and Edinburgh Tramways, capital 300,000*l*.

Asphalte pavements, now in some instances being abandoned in Paris, were at the same time becoming a favourite matter of speculation in England; though the slipperiness of the surface still remained the obstacle to their general adoption. New Co-operative Companies were still starting up, and two new banks appeared in the German Bank of London, due to some German capitalists, and the Imperial Anglo-German Bank. The Alliance was reconstructed; the arrangement for the formation afresh of the Imperial Credit Association sanctioned, and a new financial company started in Hungary, the Hungarian General Land Credit Company, the first issue of capital being 20,000,000 florins, in 100,000 shares of 200 florins, or 20*l*. each, while the third issue of the Foreign and Colonial Trust was taken up. Companies were brought into existence to give us an improved match, to increase the dock accommodation on the Thames, to print varied coloured tickets after a patented process, to supply wood pulp to paper-makers, sell us better tea, and make a Brighton Clarendon Hotel out of the old Clarendon Mansion and Bill's Old Baths.

As might have been supposed, with an easy money-market and a revived spirit among the investing middle classes, the demand for public securities throughout the year was strong. Rarely has the business transacted on the Stock Exchange been so extensive or of so legitimate a character as during the last six months. The sounder classes of Foreign Securities and English Railway Stocks were absorbed in large amounts, and a continuous advance in value was the consequence. The Funds did not benefit in the same measure, since the very low interest which they yield has now no attraction for the great mass of permanent investors. The fluctuations of Consols during the year were very trivial. On the other hand, the best Foreign Bonds, which yield a high interest, with the advantage of frequent repayments at par, and the leading home Railway Stocks—whether original, preference, or debentures—could scarcely be obtained in sufficient amounts to suit the avidity of investors. The rise in Foreign Stocks ranged from 5 to about 15 per cent.; on English Railways it averaged much higher, some of the lines representing an improvement of quite 40 per cent. as compared with the market value twelve months ago, while in at least one instance the rise was 100 per cent. The close of the year found no reaction in prices—on the contrary, they stood at their best, with every prospect of a further upward movement.

Nor was our commerce in a less healthy condition on the whole. As regards wheat we had an inferior harvest, added to which there was a great demand made by France for seed and corn for immediate consumption, to satisfy which we sent over for many weeks together as much as 30,000 quarters. The importations of corn

showed a considerable decrease up to the end of July, but a large increase afterwards, as compared with the previous year. The summer-drought of 1870, and the consequent failure of the root-crops, caused serious losses this year in respect of sheep and cattle, aggravated by a prevalence of pleuro-pneumonia and foot and mouth disease, which reached such a height in August that the attacks amounted to 22,000 per week. On the other hand, the importation of foreign cattle had doubled in ten years; and in this same month of August¹ amounted to 13,929 oxen, 13,099 cows, 18,025 calves, and 106,521 sheep. The importation of salt provisions and Australian meat was also largely increased; and the general result of an inquiry into the provisions of the year shows generally the great increase of imported food as compared with native production. But trade was good, and wages high.

To the prospects of the Church at home the year closed very threateningly, and the hopeless differences between the different sections of the Establishment were thrown into strong and dark relief by the different legal judgments of the year in ecclesiastical cases. The Court of Privy Council, by its decisions in the cases of Mr. Voysey and Mr. Purchas, two clergymen charged, the first with extreme "Broad Church," the latter with extreme "Ritualistic" views, and both equally condemned for their opinions, alienated most parties and conciliated none. The Broad Churchmen, on the whole, accepted the first judgment quietly enough, but the High Churchmen showed every sign of contemplating resistance to the will of the law, and the prospect of a considerable secession among them appeared imminent. The "Purchas judgment" decided, among other things, that the mention of the "north side of the table" in the first rubric of the Communion Service governs the whole Service, except the ordering of the elements; and that the priest, though he may go to the west side of the table to order the elements, must return to the north side before the prayer of consecration—though nothing to that effect is said in the later rubrics. Such narrowness as this seems fraught with danger. Even the Archbishop of Canterbury, in replying to a large body of memorialists, who asked him to enjoin the Bishops not to act upon the judgment of the Privy Council, and rebuking them for carping at the law, conveyed, whether intentionally or not, no small sympathy with the substance of their feeling. "The rubrics," he said, "interpreted by the Supreme Court, form the lawful rule of Divine Service, to which the clergy are bound to yield a loyal obedience, and of which they are bound to observe every particular *when required by authority*. But certainly," he went on, "as a matter of fact, not all the clergy are expected by their parishioners, or required by their bishops, rigidly to observe every point in the rubrics at all times and under all circumstances." The Bishop of Peterborough (Dr. Magee) condemned the divisions of the Church in a remarkable

¹ See the "Gentleman's Annual for 1872," Article "Commerce."

address, in which he lamented that "so great a Christian army as the Church of England should stop on the march against the enemy to fight about their uniforms." But with the Purchas and Voysey judgments fresh in men's minds, and a third great ecclesiastical judgment, in the case of *Sheppard v. Bennett*, impending as we write, for the result of which we defer any more minute inquiry into this grave subject, the clouds that lowered over the Establishment looked dark and threatening.

The marriage of the Princess Louise and the Marquis of Lorne—the promise and brightness of which enabled us to close with a sense of relief the gloomy record of last year—was the great domestic topic of the early months of the present, and our *Chronicle* contains a full account of the wedding festivities, which called out general interest and pleasure. Later in the year, a "sensation" which had long been gathering to a head took precedence of every thing else in the public mind, in the shape of the famous "Tichborne Trial." Whether a certain stout gentleman was or was not the man he professed to be—a baronet lost at sea some years before—was the momentous issue which required a trial of seventy days before the close of the Plaintiff's case, which, with the intervention of the "Long Vacation," and other minor law's delays, lasted from the end of June to the end of the year. The Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas devoted himself exclusively to it; and the Solicitor-General, who became Attorney-General in the interim, gave services scarcely less exclusive, somewhat to the wonder of the ignorant laity, who found themselves speculating on the nature of the public duties of the law officers of the Crown, which they had always heard were so heavy, and which they knew were paid so high. It was perhaps as well that so great and grave a scandal to law and lawyers as this interminable and weary trial should attract public attention at a time when the cry for Legal Reform was on all sides becoming so great, and assuming at last something like shape and consistency. The social interest in the Tichborne Case was as natural as it was amusing. From time immemorial, a mystery of personal identity has been always to the human mind the most attractive and interesting of mysteries. The authorship of "Junius" has remained (and in spite of Mr. Twisleton and Mr. Chabot will still remain) a ceaseless subject of discussion among the curious, many of whom, probably, neither know nor care to know any thing of the historical bearing of the letters themselves. And unless the truth about the "claimant" in the Tichborne Case should be placed beyond a doubt in some unexpected way,—and perhaps not even then,—we know as we write that no jury's verdict will ever set the vexed question at rest. The world was divided this year into the believers and the unbelievers. It was the first and absorbing topic at every dinner-table, and the advocates of either side could scarcely look with patience upon those who disagreed with them. The betting on the case was as regularly quoted as that on the Derby or the Boat Race, and the odds varied day by day according to the superior prowess of the claimant or Sir John Coleridge in the day's tourney. Every

particular answer seemed to every partisan confirmatory of his particular conclusion upon the case, usually "foregone" to an incredible extent. The individual—and there were few such—who ventured to form no strong opinion till he had heard something of both sides, was generally regarded as an imbecile, though it must be confessed that towards the close of the year the public interest began somewhat to decline, and to lose something of its absorbing power. The drama had been allowed to "run" too long. But the flagging excitement only required a spur, and as the new year opened with the "Defendant's Case," that spur was found. Delightful was the excitement with which the claimant's enemies dwelt upon his approaching demolition; keen was the zest with which his friends anticipated the shrivelling up of hostile witnesses under the cross-examination of the terrible Serjeant Ballantine. All the world was agreed upon but one point—commiseration for the unlucky special jurymen, whom our system carefully selects for the most part from that class of occupied men to whom time is of especial value.

The last political event of the year was a change in the honourable office of Speaker of the House of Commons, from which after long service Mr. Denison retired, to be succeeded in the post, it was soon understood, by the Right Hon. H. B. W. Brand, M.P. for Cambridgeshire, formerly Lord Palmerston's and then Lord Russell's "Whip" in the Lower House. Mr. Brand's appointment could not be considered a happy one, for a parallel reason to that which made the nomination of Sir Robert Collier to the Privy Council objectionable. Like the latter, it was an admirable appointment in itself, nor could perhaps a fitter man have been found for the place of Speaker than so clear-headed, sober, and impartial a man, and so general a favourite, as Mr. Brand. But, as in the other case, the appointment was objectionable as a precedent. The tradition of selecting a man of antecedents which had never identified him closely with the leaders on either side, it was felt by others than Mr. Gladstone's opponents, should have been jealously preserved in the appointment of a new Speaker, and above all at this particular time, when special watch seems needed over the dignity and decorum of the House of Commons. On the other hand, both in the case of Sir Robert Collier and of Mr. Brand, the Government had strong ground to stand upon in the general feeling that, other considerations apart, they had found the right man for the right place. There were not a few, too, who in spite of previous difficulties and shortcomings would on personal grounds have welcomed the return of Mr. Childers to his old post at the Admiralty, and it was at all events the subject of general congratulation that by the end of the year his shattered health was sufficiently restored to enable him to meet his constituents at Pontefract. He entered into a careful explanation of the Dockyard question, and vindicated the Admiralty policy generally. His opening words are worth quoting as a good specimen of the stuff of which the best men in England, of whatever party, are still made, and of those qualities which must

win respect with us from the keenest political antagonists. "Gentlemen," he said, "I stand here as no apologist for our naval administration in the common sense of the word apology. So far from it, I firmly believe that the great changes which we carried out will be fully recognized when transient party feeling has less weight, not only as sound in principle, but thoroughly effective in execution. This is not the place or the occasion for going into details; but I may say, in a word, that whatever may have been the success and whatever the intentions of my predecessors, I left the navy, when I was obliged to resign office, more effective, more contented, and far more prepared for any emergency than the British navy had been for many years—and that, too, at a saving to the taxpayer of at least a million and a half or a million and three-quarters per annum. I appeal fearlessly to the future history and public opinion of this country to back me in that assertion. But, gentlemen, you are doubtless aware that during my absence from Parliament there have been some vigorous naval debates and some not very sparing criticisms of my acts, and some of you may possibly think that I should be glad to take this opportunity of adverting to and refuting those criticisms. The temptation is, no doubt, great, to take advantage of so generous and sympathizing an audience as I now have for that purpose; but that is a temptation which I have made up my mind to resist. I prefer, when personal discussions of this sort are inevitable, to carry them on in the face of those who make the attack, and who will be able to reply to me. This always has been my rule. I intend to abide by it; and as I feel pretty confident from my knowledge of the men who have attacked me in my absence that they will not abstain from doing so to my face, I look forward to ample opportunities of vindicating my acts in the next session of Parliament."

And thus the year which had begun for Europe at the height of so terrible a storm, old alliances dissevered, and old friendships threatened, with "rumours of wars" on all sides, and wars in the midst, ended in profound peace. Our own relations with both France and Germany, we had grounds for hope, were fast becoming amicable again as the present bitterness passed away. Our only personal difficulty with the former country was connected with the Commercial Treaty, which was seriously threatened with a Protectionist reaction of which M. Thiers himself appeared as the chief champion; but as none of the papers connected with the negotiations upon this subject have been made public as we write, we defer further comment. The uneasiness in the direction both of Russia and America, which had prevailed with the opening year, was allayed; and though some American lawyers had attempted, in the "case" submitted to the arbitrators for their country, to treat the generous if somewhat doubtful "admissions" which we had consented to make at Washington as the basis for a claim for damages which would far exceed the war indemnity exacted from France by her conquerors, this was so far regarded in this country rather as a piece of

professional bravado, somewhat after the style of Mr. Sumner, than a serious menace to future tranquillity. Thus, on the whole, our future seemed bright enough; but already we were threatened by the danger of falling into the Scylla of security from the Charybdis of alarm. At the beginning of the year, nothing short of Prussianizing England, it seemed, would satisfy the country; at its close, the country was grumbling already at the unnecessary cost of increased armaments and efforts at improved efficiency. The Minister who had to avoid both errors had a difficult course to steer.

As we ended our record last year with pleasant thoughts of a Royal Marriage, we are glad to close it now with a yet more touching memory. Of the illness of the Prince of Wales, and the unexpected burst of loyalty which it called forth, we have already written. The Queen completed the lesson of the expiring year by making public the following letter, by which she personally accepted and answered the personal sympathy of her people, assured as we write of the steady progress of the Prince to complete recovery.

“Windsor Castle, December 26, 1871.

“The Queen is very anxious to express her deep sense of the touching sympathy of the whole nation on the occasion of the alarming illness of her dear son, the Prince of Wales. The universal feeling shown by her people during those painful, terrible days, and the sympathy evinced by them with herself and her beloved daughter, the Princess of Wales, as well as the general joy at the improvement in the Prince of Wales's state, have made a deep and lasting impression on her heart which can never be effaced. It was, indeed, nothing new to her, for the Queen had met with the same sympathy when, just ten years ago, a similar illness removed from her side the mainstay of her life, the best, wisest, and kindest of husbands.

“The Queen wishes to express at the same time, on the part of the Princess of Wales, her feelings of heartfelt gratitude, for she has been as deeply touched as the Queen by the great and universal manifestation of loyalty and sympathy.

“The Queen cannot conclude without expressing her hope that her faithful subjects will continue their prayers to God for the complete recovery of her dear son to health and strength.”

FOREIGN HISTORY.

CHAPTER I.

FRANCE.

Military Situation at beginning of the year—New Year's Day at Versailles and Paris—Progress of the Bombardment—Sorties of the 18th and of the 19th January—Disturbances in Paris—War in the North: Battles of Bapaume and St. Quentin—In the West: Battle of Le Mans—Expedition of Bourbaki: Convention of Les Verrières—Capitulation of Paris—Gambetta at Bordeaux: Conflict of Authorities—Proclamation of the Government of Defence—Elections—Meeting of National Assembly—M. Thiers Head of the Executive Power—Peace Negotiations at Versailles—Excitement in Paris—Acceptance of Preliminaries by the National Assembly—Entrance of German Troops into Paris—Break up of the German Head-Quarters.

WHEN the year 1871 opened, the capital city of France stood encompassed by the iron circle of the German hosts. All her hopes of deliverance depended on the action of the three armies which in the North, Centre, and West were endeavouring to break the enemy's lines from behind, and force their way to her walls. These armies were calculated at, in round numbers, about 450,000 men in all, but they consisted mostly of raw levies, provincial Mobs, who had never mounted horse or fired musket before, and whose steadfastness in presence of the enemy might well be doubted. The German besieging force of about 220,000 strong had the arduous double task of investing Paris with its 500,000 fighting men and its vast outer circuit of forts, and of facing round against the three armies of relief, which far outnumbered the detachments opposed to them in the north by Manteuffel, in the east by Werder, and in the west by the Duke of Mecklenburg and Von der Tann. The difficulties and dangers of existence in the midst of a hostile country increased with the increasing consumption of its resources. Large additional reinforcements were pouring in from beyond the Rhine to fill the greedy demands of this accumulating war. The German nation was groaning over the sacrifices it was called upon to make, and heartily wishing the contest to come to an end. The strain upon the endurance of the invaders at this time was unquestionably severe.

And it was upon this certainty that the indomitable French War Minister, Gambetta, built his expectations of ultimate success for the French cause. He spoke like a fanatic on the subject. He maintained that the defeat and expulsion of the enemy amounted to a mathematical demonstration, if only the defenders of the soil

would persevere. To raise fresh levies of Mobs, however raw and undisciplined; to appoint and supersede generals with feverish impatience, according as they excited or nullified his hopes—such were the methods by which this self-elected dictator drove on the war of defence from his official Cabinet at Bordeaux, flying however from time to time to different points of the military area, to inspect, animate, or organize according to the exigencies of the hour.

History, with all its surprises, has never perhaps brought to view so startling a new year's anniversary as that which was witnessed in and around the capital of France on Sunday, the 1st of January, 1871. At Versailles, in the great palace of Louis Quatorze, a brilliant assembly met, but the objects that glittered in the Hall of Mirrors were not the jewels of French dames and courtiers doing homage to the glories of a Bourbon or a Bonapartist Court: they were the helmets of victorious foes, the German warriors whom a German monarch had called around him to exchange congratulations on the downfall of French power. "The apartments of the royal palace," says a contemporary account, "have been thrown open with something of royal pomp, and the Hohenzollerns have fairly taken possession of the quarters of the Bourbons. After a Lutheran service in the Palace Chapel, with a splendid military band to assist, the King went to the *Galérie des Glaces*, where all the princes and officers were drawn up in a long line on one side, and where the King, after addressing to them a few words in a loud voice—words of thanks and of compliment on the great work of United Germany—wished them heartily a happy New Year." A banquet closed the ceremonies of the day, when, in answer to King William's New Year's greeting to his assembled guests, the Duke of Baden, as spokesman of the other German princes, concluded a long oration with the proposal of a toast to "King William the Victorious."

The beleaguered city of Paris itself had boomed in the New Year with a defiant volley of cannon. This lasted but a short time, and was felt both by besiegers and besieged to be a despairing utterance—an angry growl before the surrender which the recent capture of Mont Avron had shown to be inevitable. The weather was bitterly cold. The positions of the besieging army were covered with snow. The German sentinels, however, found excitement enough to keep them alive in waiting and watching for the long-promised sortie, to which it seemed that the enemy in their necessity must soon resort.

Inside the walls, the *Jour de l'An* passed gloomily enough. A somewhat liberal distribution of food was indeed made by order of the Government, but this rather indicated the hopelessness of long-protracted resistance than the possession of abundant stores in the background. The death-rate was rapidly increasing. The last week of the old year had given a total of nearly 4000 out of the two millions of population, small-pox carrying off about one-eighth of the number. Ominous mutterings were heard from the Belleville quarter, the stronghold of the Red Repub-

licans, whose "platform" was always the demand for government by a municipal commune. From the discontented groups on the Boulevards murmurs were heard of "A bas Trochu." The well-meaning Breton himself, whom circumstances had called to the chief military command—*cœur chaud et chevaleresque*, as his friends in other times had described him—seemed paralyzed with the difficulties of his position. He talked of his "plan:" he declared, "Le gouverneur de Paris ne capitulera pas." Still time went on, and in vain Paris waited for the propitious moment when the hosts from the provinces—certainly numerous, and always represented to them as victorious and advancing—should, in combination with the 500,000 fighting men within the fortifications, crush the unhappy Germans from before and from behind, and show the world how Frenchmen could triumph in defence of their honour and their soil!

In the course of the first week in January, Forts Nogent, Rosny, and Noisy, on the east side of Paris, were silenced by the German batteries, and a cannonade was commenced against the southern forts. As these, too, successively ceased to reply, the batteries were advanced within range of the *enceinte*, and by the middle of the month the iron shower was falling inside the city itself. On the 15th, General Trochu sent a *parlementaire* to Count Moltke, complaining of the damage done by the German shells to schools and hospitals. The German commander replied that the selection of such objects was purely accidental, caused by the fog and the great distance at which the firing had to be conducted; but, he cynically remarked, when the batteries should be moved nearer, more discrimination would be practicable.

There were critics of the German measures in this war, who doubted the policy of the bombardment. It certainly aroused a feeling of horror and dismay in the outside world to see the beautiful metropolis of France, the glory and the grace of civilization, subjected to such ruthless treatment. But there was less of reason than of sentiment in the objections raised against a proceeding which the German authorities themselves would have been glad enough to avoid had it not become a matter of vital import to shorten the resistance which they had pledged themselves to overcome. In the earlier stages of the siege, a blockade was all that was intended: it was believed by the king and by Bismarck, that the anarchy within the walls of Paris would soon wear out its powers of self-defence. The event proved otherwise; and as the provincial armies of France pressed on the outer line of the investing force, the danger of weakening the circle from within by the reinforcements it was necessary to send became obvious to the German leaders. Therefore it was that the batteries, which had so long been ready, were finally unmasked without waiting longer for the effects of either dissension or famine within the city—and assuredly no one desired more earnestly than Von Moltke, the director of the movement, that the terror of the bombardment might bring the Parisians to terms before the damage inflicted should have reached dire proportions.

On the night of the 13th a sortie was attempted by a body of French troops from Drancy, on the N.E., to Le Bourget, under cover of a cannonade from the forts. Several successive attacks were encountered by the Saxon and Prussian guards, and successfully resisted. The French fought with little heart. Their officers were heard shouting to the men, "Pour l'amour de Dieu, en avant!" But it was to no purpose; the sortie was repelled at every point.

This attempt was followed six days later by another and more important sortie; in fact, the supreme effort of the defence. It occurred on the morrow of the 18th, on which day the investing hosts at Versailles had been celebrating with unusual solemnity the elevation of their royal chief to the dignity of German Emperor. Trochu, urged at last to decisive action by the growing discontent within the walls, assembled a force to the amount of 100,000 men, composed of troops of the line, Mobiles, and National Guards, and selected for the quarter of his assault a portion of the enemy's line on the western side of Paris, about four miles in length, extending from Montretout, near St. Cloud, to Rueil. Leaving his duties as Governor of Paris to be discharged for the time by General Le Flô as deputy, he took on himself the direction of the movement, and passed the night of Wednesday the 18th in the fortress of Mont Valérien, opposite the centre of the selected line, where he was joined by Generals Bellamare, Vinoy, and Ducrot. On the morning of the 19th, each of these officers assumed the command appointed for him.

Vinoy was to attack on the left, Bellamare on the centre, and Ducrot on the right. Rations for four days had been served out. The advance had been fixed for six o'clock on the morning of Thursday; but a thick fog prevailing at that hour caused delay in the arrangements, and it did not take place till ten. Paris had been led to expect that this great outbreak of her invincible defenders would certainly be successful; and eager crowds thronged every avenue and eminence from whence a possible view of the contest might be obtained. At ten o'clock, Vinoy emerging from the rear of Mont Valérien, was seen pushing on southwards towards Montretout. The Prussians, unable at this point to meet such numbers as were brought against them, gave way. Montretout was captured, and the French proceeded to occupy the village of St. Cloud. Bellamare on his side, after some hard fighting, carried the farm of La Fougilleuse, and effected a junction on his left with the right of Vinoy's corps. But on his right, at La Bergerie, he was attacked by the Germans in force, and thrown into utter disorder. Meanwhile, Ducrot's corps, marching by Nanterre and Rueil, was arrested by the fire of the German guns in the quarries of St. Denis. A cuirassed locomotive, mounted with swivel guns, was despatched by Trochu along the St. Germain Railway, and this novel engine of war protected Ducrot, and enabled him to continue his march. But the delay had already proved fatal to French success. The Germans had brought up their reserves; and the French, attempting a concentrated action of their three

corps, a little south of La Bergerie, under cover of a volley of guns from the *enceinte*, were finally overmastered and forced to retreat. By half-past six o'clock in the evening the Germans had recaptured all their positions, and this grand sortie of the beleaguered forces had proved an entire failure. As usual, the French troops had been utterly wanting in steadiness and discipline, and had no chance whatever against the besiegers from the moment that these last had been able to bring sufficient force to bear on the part of their line exposed to attack. The German loss in killed and wounded was estimated at 1300; the French at 6000 or more, besides prisoners. To a verbal message from Trochu, requesting an armistice of forty-eight hours, Moltke returned a peremptory refusal. Time was too precious now to allow of delay.

Bitter was the dismay and deep the disappointment in Paris when the defeat of this enterprise became known. The hardships of the siege had reached a further stage of pressure. The doling out of bread in rations—a third of a pound daily to each person qualified by poverty—had just begun. Discontent with the existing Government and its falsehoods gained head. At the Belleville club, *La Marseillaise*, newly inaugurated, complaints were freely urged. One of the popular orators, M. Briosne declared, "The situation is hopeless, and why? Because the Government, following the evil example of its predecessors, has constantly disguised the truth; because it has nourished us with illusions, because it has insisted on dissimulating the power of the enemy with whom we have to contend. A month ago we had 600,000 men under arms, and provisions, and some decisive and energetic action might have been concerted with the provinces; but now we are at the last extremity, and time fails us. Who dares speak of the Commune? who would be mad enough to assume the responsibility of the situation in which we find ourselves? The Commune? Its hour is passed!" In conclusion this animated orator amidst the hysterics of his female auditors, proposed that all the men, women, and children of the city should rush upon the German camp, and either perish in a manner worthy of Paris or fight their way through the lines and inspire the whole country with a desire for vengeance. Twodays after the sortie, the luckless Trochu resigned his military command to General Vinoy, restricting himself to the functions of his civil presidency within the walls. That same afternoon—Saturday the 21st of January—the Belleville agitators marched to the prison of Mazas, and demanded the liberation of the well-known demagogue Gustave Flourens, who was there confined. While the Governor of the prison was parleying, they made their way in, and dragged forth not only Flourens but other political prisoners with him, returning afterwards in triumph to their revolutionary quarter of Belleville. Next day, Sunday, at noon, about 200 rioters, most of them in the uniform of the National Guard, marched along the Rue de Rivoli to the Hôtel de Ville. On the appearance of a few Guards the rioters fled in panic. About three o'clock another body came up from the Rue du Temple,

shouting, "A bas Trochu ! Vive la Commune !" Colonel Vabre, the Commandant, attempted a parley ; but the rioters fired on him and his friends. Then a detachment of Breton Mobiles, quartered in the Hôtel de Ville, fired in their turn ; and when, half an hour afterwards, a flag of truce was hoisted by the assailants on the Place de Grève, the façade of the Hôtel de Ville had been pitted with bullets, and between thirty and forty bodies lay killed or wounded on the ground. Next morning an order of Government was issued, suppressing two Red Republican newspapers, the *Combat* and the *Réveil*, and commanding that the clubs should be closed till the siege was over.

Disastrous as the fortunes of Paris had been within the circle of the German armies, equally disastrous was the result of the efforts on which she had depended for help from without. Her sanguine people had still fed themselves on fictions of provincial victories, scarcely asking themselves why, if the Germans were beaten on every side, the conquerors did not show their faces at the walls ? but by the time the great sortie had failed, it became ascertained somehow, and credited, that General Chanzy had been defeated in the west. The real truth was that not only was his army demolished for all fighting purposes, but that of Faïdherbe in the north, and that of Bourbaki in the east, had also been overthrown with utter overthrow. We must gather up the threads of our history by following the fortunes of each of these commanders, and relating the principal operations within their sphere of command, and elsewhere, during this eventful month of January.

On the second day of the month the fortress of Mezières, with 2000 men, 106 guns, and large stores of provisions, had capitulated, after two days' bombardment, to a division of the German forces commanded by General Von Kamecke. The capture of this stronghold was important as dispersing the Franc-tireurs, who had for some time past made it a favourite outlying point, and likewise as opening up to the invaders the whole railway line from Metz to Paris. The surrender of Rocroi followed two days afterwards.

The French Army of the North, about 60,000 strong, under the command of General Faïdherbe, had retired after its unsuccessful operations towards the close of the year 1870, into the triangle protected by the fortresses of Lille, Arras, and Cambrai. General Manteuffel, in command of the German forces opposed to him, held with a portion of his right wing under Von Göben, Bapaume, which formed the key of the roads from Amiens to this district ; and detached some troops to the southward to besiege Péronne. On the last day of the year, Faïdherbe had begun to resume the offensive, advancing cautiously by a cross-road from Vitry, near Lille, direct on Bapaume. About six miles north of that place, his advanced guard, on the 2nd of January, met the Prussian outposts and attacked them, but owing to the failure of a co-operative movement which General Robbin was to have made on his flank, he did not succeed in driving them in. The fighting was renewed on the 3rd,

when a severe action took place all along the villages lying northward of Bapaume. The Prussian forces consisted of the two brigades of the 15th Division, and a detachment under Prince Albert, the king's nephew—10,000 men in all, with eighty-four field-pieces. The French numbered 30,000 men, and had sixty pieces of cannon. Yielding to the pressure of superior numbers, the Germans retired from two of the villages attacked; and so heavy were their losses, that it is said Von Göben was making up his mind to recross the Somme, when at nightfall it was discovered that the French were themselves retreating. It appears from Faidherbe's own account that his rations and ammunitions were falling short, and that he felt himself unable to contest the possession of Bapaume. On the strength of the momentary capture of the two villages, however, he eagerly seized the pretension to claim a triumph, and the first telegrams impressed the world with the notion that a French victory had really been gained. But events soon showed that Faidherbe's failure to force Bapaume amounted to nothing less than a decisive defeat. It sealed the fate of Péronne, which capitulated a few days afterwards with 3000 prisoners; and it made Manteuffel feel sufficiently secure to carry out a new design of Von Moltke's for the campaign, and detach himself with the 2nd, 7th, and 14th Army Corps, to form together with some divisions from Zastrow's forces in the east, and from those round Paris, a separate army, bearing the name of the Fifth Army, and destined to co-operate with Werder against Bourbaki. Von Göben remained, with the 1st and 8th Army Corps and the Landwehr division, to dominate the north, and keep Faidherbe in check. He retired from Bapaume, which the French entered when it was too late to save Péronne by so doing.

No sooner, however, was Faidherbe aware of the diminution in the ranks of his opponents, than he began again to feel his way southward, or rather south-eastward; for this time, instead of seeking to force the line from Bapaume to Amiens, he aimed at preventing a threatened junction between Von Göben's forces, and those with which Colonel Krenski was pressing the siege of Longwy. A telegram from Bordeaux arrived at this juncture to inform him that the moment for a supreme effort was come, and that he must make it his object to occupy as many German troops as possible, so as to leave Paris the less encumbered. By forced marches he arrived on the south of St. Quentin, surprised a Prussian outpost, and proceeded to occupy the town. But Von Göben suddenly assumed the offensive, marched upon St. Quentin, and at nine o'clock on the morning of the 19th—the same day on which Trochu's futile sortie from the capital took place—engaged the French forces, which Faidherbe had drawn up outside the town, on the west. The Canal Crozat divided the French position, separating the 22nd from the 23rd Corps d'Armée; and as this canal was too broad and deep to be crossed, except by bridges, the two portions of Faidherbe's army were debarred from supporting each other. This circumstance proved

of fatal import, when the 23rd Corps d'Armée, composed of raw Mobiles, gave way before the fire of the German artillery. Time was lost, while some battalions of the 22nd were sent round from behind to their help; and a regular panic set in. Meanwhile the enemy's batteries were advanced to the heights nearer the town, into which some shells were thrown; then a detachment of their troops stormed the railway-station. And while the French fled pell-mell through the streets, the Germans received new accessions of strength; for Von Moltke, by a masterpiece of calculation, had divined the critical moment, and sent off the 16th Brigade, 4000 or 5000 men strong, by railway from Paris, so as to arrive at St. Quentin in time for some hours' effective work, and then return to their watch and ward around the capital. Faidherbe, in his account several months later of this day's work, exclaims piteously, "How could we withstand indefinitely the fresh troops brought continuously by rail, on the field of battle, even from Paris?"

The battle lasted seven hours. At four o'clock the French retreat was sounded. During that day and the next, the French loss—killed, wounded, and prisoners—was estimated at 15,000. The beaten army fell back, first upon Cambrai; then being pursued thither, from Cambrai to Douai; finally from Douai to Lille, where the unhappy Mobiles, whose instability had mainly caused the overthrow, arrived in wretched condition, clothed in rags and with bare feet. The French Army of the North was completely broken up for all field-operations. The towns of Arras, Douai, and Valenciennes were, however, prepared for defence, and the country around them was laid under water. The German loss at St. Quentin was estimated at 3000 killed and wounded, of whom 94 were officers.

After nine days' bombardment, Longwy capitulated on the 25th, with 4000 men and 200 guns. The antiquated defences of Vauban's time proved here also little able to withstand the force and range of modern siege-guns.

While these successes were attending the right wing of the First German Army, the operations of the left wing, in the department of the Seine Inférieure, may be summarily stated as consisting of various skirmishes and small actions, mainly between the French General Roy and the German General Von Bentheim, of which the net result was, as elsewhere, favourable to the invaders. Of these encounters the most noteworthy were the actions of the 4th of January, when a portion of the Prussian First Army Corps, issuing from Rouen, surprised and defeated a French detachment, making some 600 prisoners, and storming the ancient cluster of ruins called the "Château de Robert le Diable;" and another, a night surprise, on the 7th, when 10,000 Germans, crossing the Seine near Jumièges, came upon the French and routed them, seizing on their positions of Bourghachard and Bourgheroulde.

From the northern portions of the invaded regions of France we turn to the west. Here, at the beginning of January, General

Chanzy, commanding in all about 150,000 men,—or, as French accounts rated the numbers, about 200,000—with from 300 to 400 guns, had columns echeloned on the different roads leading to the river Loir, which runs from east to west in a northerly parallel line to the Loire. The bulk of his three Army Corps, the 16th, 17th, and 21st, were massed about Le Mans, the key-point of his position. The entrenched camp at Conlie, held by the so-called “Army of Brittany,” which had fallen into a wretched state from cold, sickness, and insufficiency of food and equipment, had been recently broken up by order of Gambetta; all the properly armed troops belonging to it were sent to join Chanzy; while, of the rest, some were distributed in small camps throughout Brittany, and 15,000 remained at Conlie. The eastern portion, or right wing, of the “Army of the Loire,” which had been severed from the left wing after the battle at Orleans in December, with Gambetta’s new levies, may have amounted to from 120,000 to 150,000 men, and was commanded by Bourbaki. At the beginning of January Bourbaki was posted south of the Loire, between Gien and Bourges, and from this position it was anticipated that he would keep employed the forces which Prince Frederick Charles commanded in person, and prevent their co-operating with the German right wing under the Grand Duke of Mecklenburg. Upon such anticipations, at least, Chanzy’s hopes of worsting his enemies and penetrating to Paris seem to have been based; and during the week, from the 6th to the 13th, when Bourbaki’s whereabouts was wrapped in mystery, speculation was rife in the sanguine brains of Frenchmen, concerning the unexpected blow he was preparing for the too adventurous enemy whom Chanzy was luring beyond the safe limit of communication with the besieging army round Paris.

Of the German forces called the Second Army, which Prince Frederick Charles had under his superior command when the year began, the 13th Corps and some supplementary detachments were concentrated under the Grand Duke of Mecklenburg in the neighbourhood of Chartres; the 18th division formed the garrison of Orleans, and the 9th Corps was stationed near that city; the 3rd Corps (Brandenburgers) and the Hessians were on the Loire, to the east of Orleans; the 10th Corps (Hanoverians) occupied the country between Blois and Vendôme. The Bavarians, under Von der Tann, were in the rear, resting from their recent exertions, and recruiting their ranks. Altogether the Prince’s available strength at this time may have amounted to 120,000 men. Owing to the excellence of the German war-intelligence he was soon satisfied that he had nothing to fear from Bourbaki’s intentions; therefore, leaving that general to pursue his own schemes, he lost no time in striking off westward, so as to bring the whole of his forces to bear against Chanzy.

The strategy he determined to adopt was a strategy often applied with success by German commanders during this war and the Austrian War of 1866; namely, that of making double attacks upon

the enemy at right angles to each other, and so causing him to face two ways at once. It has been remarked that, though likely to be successful when the enemy is inferior in dexterity and discipline, this mode of manœuvring might be dangerous when the conditions are reversed. In the Loire campaign of 1871 it was attended with triumphant results for the Germans. The Duke of Mecklenburg's Corps made a circuitous move from Chartres, so as to descend upon the French towards Le Mans from the north and north-east, while Prince Frederick Charles himself worked along the line of the river Loir as far as Vendôme, and then struck up at an angle so as to come against Chanzy from the south-east. On the 8th and 9th skirmishes took place, in which the dispersed French columns, both on the Loir and the Loire, were cut up and driven in bit by bit, and Chanzy was compelled to concentrate his forces near his main position at Le Mans. On, through the inclement winter weather, and over such slippery roads that the Prince had at times to dismount and walk, the Germans pressed, giving their enemy no time to pause. On the 10th they received reinforcements to the amount of 60,000 men. On that day, and on the 11th and 12th, a series of engagements were fought in the neighbourhood of Le Mans, in all of which they were victorious. On the 10th Chanzy attempted to make a double stand at Parigné l'Évêque and Changé on his right, and at Champigny on his left, but was severely worsted by Alvensleben. The next day the Grand Duke's Corps, constituting the right wing of the German forces, crossed the river Huisne, and encountered the French at Lombron and La Chapelle. At the same time Alvensleben pushed forward from the south-east. The great battle of Le Mans had begun. The Germans are said to have brought 120,000 men into the field on this occasion. The French reckoned their own forces at 200,000, but they may have been less by a fourth. The French were beaten on all sides. At nightfall the Germans retired to defensive positions. A renewal of the attack was expected at daybreak. The Germans, however, did not wait till then. In the middle of the night the town was awakened by the booming of cannon. A violent artillery attack had been directed against the eminence of La Tuilerie on the left bank of the Huisne, where a detachment of Breton mobilized Guards were in position. These troops, raw and unsteady, yielded to the effects of surprise. Precipitately harnessing their horses to their guns they retreated into the town, down the still lighted streets of which a panic of dismay rapidly spread. Reports of total disasters were bruited about. Chanzy, though exerting himself to the utmost, was labouring under illness, and unable to bring the energies of a master-mind to bear on the situation. He called his subaltern generals to council, Jaurequiberry, Colomb, and Gaugard, and resigned himself to their decision that a retreat was necessary. In the town all was excitement when the morning fairly shone. The alarm-bell rang, the National Guards assembled. Trains were filled with the retreating troops, the last

train leaving at 2.30 p.m. Then the conquerors marched in. Two of their army corps were stationed to occupy the town. Other detachments pursued the French along the three directions in which they had retired. Prince Frederick Charles made Le Mans his head-quarters on the 13th. On the 17th the Duke of Mecklenburg entered Alençon. The defeated General Chanzy, with the 16th French Corps, stopped at Laval, but the greater part of his army continued to fall back. The Breton Mobiles were utterly demoralized. The camp at Conlie was evacuated with even more precipitation than Le Mans had been. Nevertheless, Chanzy, with the incorrigible mendacity of French officials in this war, telegraphed to Bordeaux that he was effecting his retreat in "excellent order." What the confusion and rout really were we have abundant witnesses to tell us. In this week of battles it is estimated that no less than 20,000 French were made prisoners.

At Laval, on the 17th, Chanzy was visited by Gambetta. That indefatigable minister, having discussed the "situation," which he, at all events, was as far as ever from considering hopeless, proceeded two days afterwards to St. Malo, took steamer for Cherbourg, and on the 21st arrived at Lille. There he delivered a speech from the balcony of the Prefecture, advocating resistance to the bitter end, and roundly condemning the partisans of peace at any price. Let France but persevere, he said, and notwithstanding any number of defeats her success in the end was certain.

Meanwhile, what had Bourbaki been doing? Leaving a part of his forces—the 15th Corps—at Bourges, in order that it might cover his present designs, and also form the nucleus of a new army, he carried off the 18th, 20th, and 24th Corps—in all some 133,000 men, with 330 guns—eastward, across Central France, to the Saône. His object was to seize the Pass of Belfort, situated between the important fortress of that name and Vesoul, and thus to separate the forces of General Werder, stationed at Vesoul, from those with which General Treschkow was pressing the siege of Belfort, at the same time cutting off the communications of the enemy from Germany in the quarter most available to them as a base of operations. His march began on the 5th of January. For nearly a week his movements were wrapped in mystery. His sanguine compatriots anticipated that he was preparing some grand stroke; but where it was to fall they knew not.

A German report that on Monday the 9th, the troops of General Werder had had an action with the *eighteenth* French Corps was held at first to be a mistake. On the 10th, however, two telegrams proclaimed that such was indeed the fact. One was from the King of Prussia to his Queen. "Yesterday," he said, "General Werder had a victorious engagement with the troops of General Bourbaki at Valleriois, to the south of Vesoul. He captured 300 prisoners." The other was from Bourbaki himself, asserting—what at first sight seemed the contradictory statement—that he had occupied the night in driving the Germans from the houses in

Villersexel (near to Valleriois), which place they had finally evacuated. The real fact was, that Bourbaki's intended surprise had been anticipated and foiled; but as Werder's only object, with his inferior numbers, was to keep back his assailant long enough to enable him to gain the road to Belfort, that object gained, he evacuated Villersexel readily enough, giving Bourbaki thereby a right to claim the possession of the ground temporarily contested.

The junction of the two German forces was no longer preventible. On the 10th Werder was slowly falling back upon Belfort by way of Montbéliard. Bourbaki followed, but with fatal want of expedition, owing to the wretchedly unprovided state of his troops, and also to the mistake he had made in throwing his men forward too much on one line of road. It took him five days to traverse the twenty miles which lay between Villersexel and the position which the Germans now took up at Héricourt, a little to the south of Belfort. At the termination of this march, he deployed his troops with the intention of investing the enemy in the lines round Belfort, stretching his left wing forward to the north, and his right wing eastward, along the angle formed by the rivers Lisaine and Allaine. From the 14th to the 17th he directed a series of desultory attacks against the troops of Werder; who, on his part, instead of continuing his route to join Treschkow and the siege of Belfort, had faced round upon the pursuing French, and posted his troops from Delle to Héricourt. Werder's force consisted of one Prussian and three Baden brigades, and a division of Landwehr—in all from 35,000 to 40,000 men. The French opposed to him numbered 130,000. In spite of the enormous odds, Werder successfully maintained his position during the three days' battle of Belfort (or of Héricourt, as it was at first designated): each night his troops bivouacked on the same spot they had occupied in the morning; and when a last attempt of the French to turn the right wing of the Germans on the 17th had again resulted in failure, Bourbaki, disheartened, and fearing lest his communications with Besançon should be cut off by some other detachment of the German forces, gave the order for retreat. He had lost upwards of 10,000 men in the three days' fighting; the Germans only 1200. His retreat began on the 18th; Werder, allowing his own troops very little time to pause, followed him. From other quarters likewise the German toils were closing round this unfortunate general.

We have seen that, owing to the well-organized war-intelligence of the invaders, Bourbaki's march eastward was known at Versailles as soon as it was decided on. It is said that this manœuvre had given the second and last serious alarm to the great strategist who, from the head-quarters at Versailles, directed the movements of the German hosts. His first misgiving had been when D'Aurelle des Paladines defeated Von der Tann at Coulmiers. Now once more he seems to have felt that the strain upon a weak point of the German line might not improbably prove too severe. Had Bourbaki's forces and his skill been equal to the occasion,

that general might have thrown back Werder into the Rhine Valley, and seized upon the Paris and Strasbourg Railway; in which case it would have been difficult, if not impossible, for the Germans to maintain the investment of Paris. Among military critics, therefore, there were those who maintained that, if only executed as well as conceived, Bourbaki's eastward march would have been an able stroke of strategy. But it failed; and not only was its failure ruinous to the troops who had to carry it out, the movement itself was the cause of ruin to Chanz y and the other branch of the Loire army, as the course of our narrative has shown, by releasing Prince Frederick Charles from any pressure on his left.

Meanwhile, Moltke, whose genius was never more conspicuous than when warding against possible combinations of evil, had, as early as the first week in January, detached Manteuffel from the Army of the North, and given him in charge to amalgamate certain divisions into a Fifth Army, and march south-eastward from Paris, by Châtillon, towards Belfort. The roads were difficult, and were rendered worse by the frost; and when, on the 19th, Manteuffel's advanced detachments reached the valley of the Saône, the battle of Belfort had already been fought and won by Werder single-handed. As soon as he heard the news of Werder's successes, and of Bourbaki's retreat, instead of continuing his march to Belfort, Manteuffel, without loss of time, swung round to his right, and marched southwards, with the object of intercepting the defeated enemy. Meanwhile, one of his brigades, under Keller, was directed to keep the Garibaldians employed at Dijon, so preventing their force of 25,000 men from affording any help to Bourbaki. On the 23rd some of Manteuffel's corps came across the French communications at St. Vit, south of Besançon. General Cremer, commanding the rear of the French army, was despatched to the van to meet them, and then ordered back to Besançon. Two days were wasted by Bourbaki in indecision and inactivity. On the 26th, reduced to desperation, not only by the ill success of his own plans, it is said, but also by the harassing interference of Gambetta, the luckless commander attempted to commit suicide. Then a disorderly retreat took place in the direction of Pontarlier. Here also the Germans came across the road of the fugitives, and an encounter took place, in which the French lost 15,000 prisoners, and numerous guns and provision-waggons. Finally, the remainder of Bourbaki's army, forced away from their home communications, found no road open to them but that into Switzerland; and on the 1st of February a convention was signed at Les Verrières, between General Clinchamps, Bourbaki's successor in the command, and the Swiss General, Herzog, by which the whole force, 80,000 in number, was received within the Swiss territory, on condition of laying down their arms, and being "interned" as prisoners on a neutral soil. Of the miserable condition of these soldiers at the termination of their abortive expedition, we have the following vivid account from an eye-witness:—

"Hundreds of poor fellows, their uniforms torn to rags, limped past. The feet and hands of nearly all were frost-bitten, causing the greatest pain. On many a face incipient fever had begun its ravages; many would never march again. In all, the shrunk features and crouching gait told of gnawing hunger, while the deep cough and hoarse voice bore witness to long nights spent on snow and frozen ground. Some had tied bits of wood under their bare feet to protect them from the stones; others wore wooden *sabots*; hundreds had no socks, and when they had, they were merely of thin cotton; others, who appeared well shod, would show a toeless or heelless boot, the exposed part of the foot, once frozen, being now a wound crusted with dirt. For weeks none had washed, or changed their clothes, or removed their boots. Nothing but hurried march and counter-march. Their hands were blacker than any African's. Some had lost their toes, the limbs of others were so frozen that every movement was agony. The men stated that for three days they had had neither food nor fodder served out to them, and that before that they often got only one loaf between eight men."

So ended the disastrous expedition of Bourbaki. Garibaldi, who ought to have prevented Manteuffel's descent on his prey, made but a poor figure at this crisis of the campaign. He boasted of having maintained his position at Dijon, but the fact was that he allowed himself to be occupied with petty operations against Keller, who was sent purposely to hoodwink him, and permitted the main body of his foes to slip past on their southern march without obstruction. When at last he did move on their track, it was too late. The beaten troops of Bourbaki had entered Switzerland.

On the 26th, while Bourbaki's disastrous retreat was in full progress, the Duke of Mecklenburg's army, advancing northwards from Alençon, had reached Rouen, thereby effecting a junction with the German Army of the North.

The news of these successive overthrows, that of the Army of the West at Le Mans on the 12th, of the Army of the Centre at Héricourt on the 17th, and of the Army of the North on the 19th, thus baffling every hope of relief from without, together with the disastrous failure of the sortie from within on the 19th, could hardly fail to quench at last the illusive confidence of the inhabitants of Paris. The effect of the last-named disaster in exasperating the Red Republicans we have already seen. The Government indeed succeeded in stifling the *émeute* of the 22nd. The resignation of Generals Trochu and Le Flô had been a sop to public discontent. General Vinoy, the new Governor of Paris, and General Clément Thomas, the Commandant of the National Guard, had been received on that very Sunday afternoon with cries of "Vive l'ordre!"

But the energies of the Provisional Government were exhausted. Sickness and starvation were extending their ravages within the town. The week's death-rate had risen to 4465; the rations of bread were reduced; 8000 horses hitherto exempted from the sham-bles on the plea of the public service were now condemned to like

fate with their fellows. And in spite of these devices, when a careful investigation was instituted into the actual amount of provisions still available, it was found that there had been a previous miscalculation, and that the city was actually some eight days nearer to total starvation than its rulers had anticipated. It scarcely needed this discovery to make them decide on capitulation.

On Monday, the 23rd of January, at five o'clock in the afternoon, Count Bismarck's carriage, which had been sent to the outposts in consequence of a notice from Paris, drove back to his quarters at Versailles, bearing inside it as diplomatic representative of the Government of Defence, M. Jules Favre himself. Careworn and aged in appearance since the day when he and Bismarck had parted after the conference at Ferrières, no longer proudly holding out for every inch of France's territory and every stone of her fortresses, Jules Favre had come to seek the best terms the victorious foe could give him in return for the inevitable surrender of a lost cause. On previous occasions Bismarck had declared that he did not recognize the Government of National Defence—"Messieurs du pavé"—as a power competent to make treaties; and, therefore, it was rather by a convenient evasion of his own words that he consented now to come to terms with them as to the fate of the nation. His plea was, that as the power actually disposing of the military forces of the country, the so-called Government of National Defence was capable of concluding an armistice, and instrumentally capable of bringing about the meeting of a National Assembly which should represent the decision of the country at large on the questions of eventual peace or war. To Favre's first proposal that the case of Paris should be considered as separate from that of France, and that the progress of the war in other quarters should not be interfered with by the submission of the capital, the German Chancellor gave a decided negative. He would hear of no capitulation without the condition of an armistice, to be observed throughout the kingdom, except in the eastern provinces, where just at the moment imminent ruin was threatening the forces of Bourbaki, and the siege of Belfort was being pressed to a successful conclusion by the Germans. The negotiations continued during six days, Jules Favre going backwards and forwards to consult with his colleagues in Paris, two of whom, Picard and Dorian, were allowed to join him at Versailles, Count Bismarck repairing to his master's quarters at the Prefecture with convenient deference, it is said, when any concession was asked for from the German side. On the 29th the following telegram was sent by the Emperor William to his Empress at Berlin:—

"Imperial Head-Quarters, Versailles, Jan. 29, 2 p.m.

"Last night an armistice for three weeks was signed.

"The troops of the Line and the Mobiles will be interned in Paris as prisoners of war.

"The Garde Nationale Sédentaire undertakes the preservation of order.

"We occupy all the forts.

"Paris remains invested. It will be allowed to procure provisions as soon as the arms have been delivered up.

"A Constituent Assembly will be summoned to meet at Bordeaux in a fortnight.

"The armies in the field retain possession of the respective tracts of country occupied by them, with neutral zones intervening.

"This is the first blessed reward of patriotism, heroism, and heavy sacrifices. I thank God for this fresh mercy. May peace soon follow!"

Jules Favre had at first stipulated that the whole French garrison should be allowed to march out with all the honours of war. To this Bismarck would by no means consent. He insisted that they should surrender as prisoners of war, and lay down their arms, with the exception of 12,000, who should serve as guardians of public order, under General Vinoy. Subsequently, at the earnest representations of M. Favre—it was a concession which that Minister before long had bitter occasion to repent of having obtained—he consented to allow the National Guard also to retain their arms and act as a police-force within the city. Paris was to pay a contribution of 200,000,000 francs within a fortnight. All the forts were to be surrendered without delay, and to be garrisoned by German troops; an exchange of prisoners was also stipulated. The armistice was to begin at Paris at once, and in the departments in three days, and it was to expire on the 13th of February at noon.

As soon as the armistice was signed, the Germans, who had been collecting large stores of food in anticipation of the event, sent in some millions of rations to meet the immediate distress. The London Relief Committee, under the superintendence of the Lord Mayor, next despatched their first consignment of provisions by special trains, *via* Folkestone and Dieppe. In the week between the 3rd and the 10th of February it was calculated that about 9600 tons of flour, 450 tons of rice, 900 tons of biscuit, 360 tons of fish, 3700 tons of fuel, and nearly 7000 head of live stock, besides 2000 tons of other provisions, had been received by the famished city. The distress was greatest in the class of middling gentry and tradesmen and small *employés*; people too independent to throw themselves on the public rations, and not having money at command to meet the heavy price of provisions. The richer and also the poorer ranks had suffered little comparatively; but it was the misfortune of the charitable supplies so largely sent in from England and elsewhere that, owing to a bad system of distribution, they failed to relieve in any thing like due proportion the wants of those who really wanted.

At Bordeaux the news of the armistice was received with popular indignation. A large assembly was held on Sunday evening (29th) in the theatre, when a protest was made against it, and resolutions passed voting the maintenance of power in the hands of

Gambetta and war à outrance. Gambetta published an animated proclamation, addressed to the prefects of France. He declared that his policy, as Minister of War, was still the same; and that the three weeks of the armistice must be diligently employed in reinforcing and disciplining the armies which were ultimately to rescue the country from its invaders. On the 31st he addressed the citizens in another proclamation, reiterating these martial sentiments. "Something more sinister and painful," he said, "than the fall of Paris has come upon us. Unknown to us, without informing us and without consulting us, an armistice has been signed, of which we have but too late learned the guilty thoughtlessness, which surrenders to the Prussian troops departments occupied by our soldiers, and imposes upon us the obligation to remain inactive for three weeks, in order to convoke a National Assembly in the sad circumstances in which our country finds itself. We have demanded an explanation from Paris, and have kept silence while awaiting, before addressing you, the promised arrival of a member of the Government, to whom we had determined to remit our powers as members of the Delegate Government. . . . Nobody, however, has come from Paris, and we must act, and at any price upset the perfidious calculations of the enemies of France. Prussia reckons on the armistice. Prussia hopes that the National Assembly, convoked after successive defeats, and while the dreadful impression of the fall of Paris prevails, will be necessarily trembling and ready to accept a shameful peace. It rests with you that these calculations should fail." He declared that "no reactionary or cowardly Assembly should be summoned, but one which should be ready for any thing rather than assist at the assassination of France." This proclamation he followed up by a decree convoking the electors for the 8th of February, and enacting that all persons should be held ineligible as candidates who should either be members of families heretofore reigning in France, or who should have accepted the functions of Minister, Senator, Councillor of State, or Prefect, or been officially nominated as candidates for the Legislative Assembly during the reign of Napoleon III. The German Chancellor at once telegraphed a protest to the fier- patriot, complaining of his decree as an "arbitrary and oppressive" act, contrary to the freedom of election stipulated by the armistice. Gambetta indignantly repudiated the right of Prussia to interfere in such a matter. Then Jules Favre assured Bismarck that the decree should be annulled; and M. Jules Simon was sent to Bordeaux, bringing the Paris decree of the 28th relative to the elections, which ignored all Gambetta's disqualifications with the exception of that excluding heretofore reigning families. But Simon could find no bill-stickers to post up his paper, and was afraid to show himself in the streets, where Gambetta and his party held up their heads confidently. It was plain that more stringent measures must be taken to quell the "Young Dictator." Accordingly, on the 4th of February the *Journal Officiel* of Paris published the following manifesto:—

“THE GOVERNMENT OF THE NATIONAL DEFENCE.

“Considering that a decree has been issued by the Delegation of the Government in Bordeaux on the 31st of January, 1871, by which various categories of citizens, who, by the decree of the Government of the 29th January, 1871, are eligible for the National Assembly, are declared ineligible: Considering that the restrictions imposed upon the elections by the said decree are incompatible with the principle of the freedom of universal suffrage, ordains: That the above-mentioned decree, issued by the Delegation in Bordeaux, is null and void: That the decrees of the 29th of January, 1871, are maintained in their integrity.

“General TROCHU.

JULES FERRY.

JULES FAVRE.

EMMANUEL ARAGO.

GARNIER-PAGÉS.

EUGENE PELLETAN.

ERNEST PICARD.

“Paris, Feb. 4, 1871.”

With this decree in their hands, MM. Arago, Garnier-Pagés, and Eugene Pelletan arrived at Bordeaux on the 6th, and it was resolved not only to cancel Gambetta's contumacious ordinances, but to put an end at once to the authority of the Delegation Government, of which he was the chief representative, and for which no necessity any longer existed, now that communication was re-established between the capital and the country at large. Gambetta did not wait for his dismissal. On the day that the Paris Ministers arrived at Bordeaux he gave in his resignation. Arago was appointed Minister of War *ad interim*. So ended this inopportune conflict of authorities. The Republican cities of the South—Lyons, Marseilles, and Toulouse—had applauded the policy of Gambetta; but in the North—at Rouen, Lille, and elsewhere—his decrees were repudiated, and those of the Paris Government upheld.

And here we must find room for some passages of an important historical document—to wit, the proclamation issued in Paris by the Government on the 4th of February, explaining at large their reasons for the capitulation, and likewise for the course taken with regard to the election for the Assembly:—

“Frenchmen,—Paris has laid down its arms when on the verge of starvation. It had been told, ‘hold out for a few weeks, and we will deliver you.’ It resisted for five months, and, despite of heroic efforts, the Departments have not been able to succour it. Paris resigned itself to the most cruel privations; it accepted ruin, disease, and exhaustion. During a whole month shells have poured into the city, slaying women and children. For upwards of six weeks the few grammes of bad bread distributed to each inhabitant have scarcely sufficed to maintain life; and when, thus vanquished by the most inexorable necessity, the great city comes to a standstill in order not to condemn 2,000,000 inhabitants to the most horrible

catastrophe, when, profiting by its remnant of strength, it treats with the enemy instead of submitting to an unconditional surrender, the Government of the National Defence is accused elsewhere of culpable levity, is denounced and repudiated. Let France judge us, and all those who but yesterday were prodigal in their protestations of friendship and respect, but who to-day insult us. . . . When at the end of January we resigned ourselves to an effort to make terms it was very late. We had flour only for ten days, and we knew that the devastation of the country rendered revictualling very uncertain. Those who now declaim against us will never know the anguish we have endured. It was, however, necessary to conceal our anxieties, and to approach the enemy with resolution—with an appearance of readiness still to fight, and of possessing ample provisions. What we desired was this—above all things to usurp no rights. To France alone it belonged to dispose of herself. We desired to reserve that right to her. It cost protracted efforts to obtain the recognition of her sovereignty. It forms the most important feature of our treaty. We have preserved to the National Guard its liberty and its arms. If, notwithstanding our efforts, we have been unable to exempt the army and the Garde Mobile from the operation of the rigorous laws of war, at least we have preserved them from a captivity in Germany and confinement in an intrenched camp under Prussian muskets. We are reproached with not having consulted the Delegation at Bordeaux, but it is overlooked that we were enclosed within an iron circle, that we were unable to break through. It is moreover forgotten that every passing day rendered more terrible the catastrophe of famine, and yet we maintained the discussion, contesting the ground inch by inch for six days, while the inhabitants of Paris, ignorant of their real situation and influenced only by a generous ardour, demanded to be led out to fight. . . . We have summoned France to elect freely an Assembly which at this supreme crisis will make known its will. We recognize in no one a right to impose a decision upon it either for peace or for war. . . . In order that its will may be imposed upon all as a law to be respected, there must be the sovereign expression of the free suffrage of all. Now, we do not admit that arbitrary restrictions can be imposed upon that suffrage. . . . To recall the memories of past dissensions at a time when the enemy treads our blood-stained soil is to retard by their rancours the great task of the deliverance of the country. We regard principles as superior to expedients. We do not wish that the first decree of convocation of the Republican Assembly in 1871 should be an act of mistrust directed against the electors. To them belongs the sovereignty; let them exercise it without weakness and the country may be saved. The Government of the National Defence regrets, then, and annuls, if it should be necessary, the decree illegally issued by the Delegation at Bordeaux, and it calls upon all Frenchmen to vote without ostracism for the representatives who may appear to them to be the worthiest of France. *Vive la République! Vive la France!*

"The Members of the Government,—

"General TROCHU.	EUGENE PELLETAN.
JULES FAVRE.	ERNEST PICARD.
JULES FERRY.	EMMANUEL ARAGO.
GARNIER PAGÉS.	

"The Ministers,—

"DORIAN.	General LE FLÔ.
J. MAGNIN.	F. HEROLD.

"Paris, Feb. 4, 1871."

Meanwhile the Germans, whose leaders trusted nothing to chance, or even to probabilities, made every preparation for continued war in case of French obstinacy. Ominous hints were telegraphed from Versailles: "The German arrangements," it was said, "for over-running France from end to end, should she refuse to submit, will be terribly effective. The temper of the German troops will be very stern should the French pursue the struggle." Another report announced, "With their usual energy the Germans are preparing for a prolonged war. Though they feel almost sure that the end of the war has come, they are arranging every thing to march against Lyons and Bordeaux. Should warlike counsels prevail among the French, fresh reinforcements will be called from Germany. The troops already in the field will press quickly forward. The complete conquest of France will at once be taken in hand." But with the retirement of Gambetta the war fever throughout the country had become effectually mitigated, as the result of the popular appeal presently showed.

The elections to the National Assembly took place on the 8th of February. All the numerous parties into which French politicians were divided brought forward their candidates and their manifestoes. Among these, in spite of the disqualifying provisions as to families that had once been royal, appeared the names of the Orleans Princes, the Duc d'Aumale and the Prince de Joinville. "When I consider the situation of France," said the Duc d'Aumale, in his address, "her history, her traditions, the events of the last year, I am struck with the advantages which a constitutional monarchy presents. I believe it can respond to the legitimate aspirations of a democratic society, and guarantee, with order and security, every kind of progress and of liberty. It is with a mixture of filial pride and of patriotic sorrow that I compare France in her actual state with what she was under the reign of my father. . . . In my sentiments, in my past, in the traditions of my family, I find nothing which separates me from the Republic. If it be under this form that France wishes to constitute her Government, I am ready to bow before her sovereignty, and will remain her faithful servant."

In Paris the elections went off quietly, possibly because the day happened to be a rainy one. It was estimated that about one-fourth of the electors abstained from voting. The successful candidates were, as might have been anticipated, mostly of the advanced Radical type. At the head of the list stood Louis Blanc:

then Victor Hugo, Garibaldi, Quinet, Gambetta, Rochefort. After events attached celebrity to some other names that may here be mentioned; to that of Admiral Saisset, who attained a temporary popularity with the electors in consequence of a mistaken notion that he had meant to resist the Government capitulation; of Felix Pyat, the audacious journalist, editor of "*Le Vengeur*," and chief of the so-called "school of political assassination;" of Ranc, who had acted as Gambetta's secretary, and was a man of harsh character and extreme opinions; of Charles Delescluze, an old democratic agitator of the times of 1848, one who had had much experience of revolution, of exile and of prison, and of whom his worst enemies were willing to say that he was honest and enthusiastic. Four members of the International Society were chosen. Perhaps about one-third of the forty-three deputies for the Seine department were men of comparatively moderate and Conservative opinions; among these were Thiers, Favre, and Dorian.

However Radicalism might come to the front in Paris and in some of the other great cities, the general character of the Assembly, returned in consequence of this appeal to the popular voice throughout France, was highly Conservative, and indeed reactionary. The question submitted to the candidates was simply that of making peace or carrying on war; and it was natural that those who came forward on the peace platform should be mostly members of that political party which had had nothing whatever to do with the Napoleonist government or the Republican propaganda; the old Legitimists, in fact, whose voice had so long been silent. The character given of the Assembly by Gustave Flourens, in a pamphlet which he published a few weeks later, is instructive as showing in what light the new Deputies of the Right were regarded at the very outset by the advanced democrats. "The result was," he said, "that we had a chamber the counterpart of that of the Restoration; a chamber of ghosts, of people who were thought to be dead long ago, and who appeared to be quite untouched—to be still alive. Marquises and Abbés, who had without doubt sat in the States-General of 1789 on the benches of the nobility and clergy; a collection of bald heads, deaf ears, and eyes which blinked at any ray of sunlight. This Assembly ought to have had a gravedigger for doorkeeper. For such owls, the cry of *Vive la République!* was an intolerable outrage¹." This resuscitated party acquired the name of the "*Rurals*."

M. Thiers was returned for 20 out of the 86 Departments; a decided proof that he was looked upon at this juncture by the majority of his fellow-countrymen as the statesman who was most to be trusted for extricating France from its difficulties. Gambetta's name was seen on several lists.

The prospect of a pacific policy on the part of the new Assembly, which the general result of the elections held forth, induced Count Bismarck to concede a prolongation of the armistice till the 24th of February. On the 16th Belfort capitulated. The garrison, 12,000

¹ "Paris Livré." G. Flourens. 1871.

strong, was allowed to march out with full military honours. This was the final operation of the great Franco-German War of 1870-71.

Meanwhile, on the 13th, the National Assembly was opened at Bordeaux. From 300 to 400 Members were present. Jules Favre, in the name of his colleagues, surrendered the powers of the Government of Defence into the hands of the Assembly, but engaged that they would hold them provisionally till their successors should be appointed. Fifteen committees were then constituted, after the precedent of 1849. Garibaldi was present, and sent in his resignation, in writing, to the temporary acting President of the Assembly. Having done which, he desired to say a few words. The President, however, took no notice of his request, and declared the Assembly adjourned. Some uproar followed. When he had entered his carriage, Garibaldi stood up and declared that he had wished to fight for France, and to serve the Republican cause; but that now his mission was at an end. The crowd replied with shouts of *Vive Garibaldi!* *Vive la République!* and on the following day, the popular hero quitted Bordeaux for Marseilles, thence to take ship for his island-home of Caprera.

On the 17th the Assembly, which had already appointed M. Grévy as its President, proceeded to choose a head of the Executive Administration. The statesman fixed upon was M. Thiers. His answer was delivered in a written speech. Though appalled, he said, at the painful task imposed upon him by the country, he accepted it with obedience, devotion, and love—sentiments of which France stood all the more in need, forasmuch as she was unfortunate, more unfortunate than at any former period of her history. But, he added, she is still great, young, rich, and full of resources; and will always remain a lasting monument of human energy. He then announced the list of the Ministers whom he had selected as his colleagues: these were—M. Dufaure, Minister of Justice; Jules Favre, of Foreign Affairs; Picard, of the Interior; Jules Simon, of Public Instruction; Lambrecht, of Commerce; Le Flô, of War; Potthuan, of Marine; De Larcy, of Public Works.

In the sitting of the 17th occurred an incident which might have proved embarrassing. A declaration was laid before the Assembly by M. Keller, signed by the Deputies of the Departments in Alsace and Lorraine, to the effect that they desired to remain French, and to be guaranteed from the threatened severance. M. Thiers dexterously urged that the petition should be taken into consideration at once; and thus driven to a point, the Committee appointed to consider the subject resolved that it should be handed over to the negotiators who were about to treat with Prussia; whereby the difficulty was evaded.

On the 19th M. Thiers addressed the House. He said that he did not lay down any programme. A programme was always a vague thing, but at the present time there was only one line of policy to follow; and there was urgent need to put an end to the evils afflicting the country, and to terminate the occupation by the enemy.

The country had need of peace, which must be courageously discussed, and only accepted if honourable. He announced the reconstitution of the Councils-General and the municipalities by fresh elections. The Government, he declared, would devote all its powers to pacify and reorganize the country, to revive credit, and reorganize labour: nothing was more pressing than that task. The Constitutional question should be left in abeyance till France was out of the enemy's grasp.

Jules Favre then proposed that the Assembly should appoint a Committee of fifteen Deputies to proceed at once to Paris, and be in constant communication with the negotiators, duly reporting upon their proceedings to the Assembly.

M. Thiers proposed that the Assembly should suspend its sittings during the negotiations.

On Monday, the 21st, M. Thiers, M. Jules Favre, M. Ernest Picard, and the fifteen Commissioners chosen from the Assembly, arrived in Paris. M. Thiers spent the whole of the next day in conference with Count Bismarck at Versailles. On Wednesday he was received by the German Emperor at the Prefecture, and then visited the Crown Prince. The armistice was extended to the evening of Sunday, the 26th, the German negotiators announcing positively that should further delays be interposed, the war should be renewed at that moment, and no later. Thus driven into a corner, the French negotiators were obliged to renounce the hope of support from the neutral Powers with which they had hitherto dallied; and the Emperor William telegraphed to Berlin on the 26th, that the Preliminaries of peace had just been signed, and were awaiting the ratification of the Assembly at Bordeaux. The armistice was then extended to the 6th, and subsequently to the 12th of March.

The Preliminaries were these:—

"1. France renounces in favour of the German Empire the following rights:—The fifth part of Lorraine, including Metz and Thionville, and Alsace less Belfort.

"2. France will pay the sum of five milliards of francs, of which one milliard is to be paid in 1871, and the remaining four milliards by instalments extending over three years.

"3. The German troops will begin to evacuate the French territory as soon as the Treaty is ratified. They will then evacuate the interior of Paris and some Departments lying in the western region. The evacuation of the other Departments will take place gradually after payment of the first milliard, and proportionately to the payment of the other four milliards.

"Interest at the rate of five per cent. per annum will be paid on the amount remaining due from the date of the ratification of the Treaty.

"4. The German troops will not levy any requisitions in the Department occupied by them, but will be maintained at the cost of France.

"5. A delay will be granted to the inhabitants of the territories annexed, to choose between the two nationalities.

"6. Prisoners of war will be immediately set at liberty.

"7. Negotiations for a definitive Treaty of Peace will be opened at Brussels after the ratification of the Treaty.

"8. The administration of the Departments occupied by the German troops will be entrusted to French officials, but under the control of the chiefs of the German Corps of Occupation.

"9. The present Treaty confers upon the Germans no rights whatever in the portion of territories not occupied.

"10. The Treaty will have to be ratified by the National Assembly of France."

A Convention was added for admitting 30,000 men of the German army to a three days' occupation of a certain portion of the capital; a sign and symbol of triumph which the leaders insisted on as a needful reward to them for the labours of the siege.

As the inevitable hour of decision drew near, the excitement in Paris became ominous. At half-past four on Sunday afternoon the signatures of the negotiators had ratified the Treaty; and M. Thiers returned from Versailles to Paris to communicate with the Fifteen. Till then a confident hope had been entertained by the inhabitants of the city that at all events the presence of the hated enemy within their sacred walls would be warded off. Great was their exasperation at the disappointment. Crowds wandered through the streets all night. A midnight meeting was held at the *Marseillaise* Club in Belleville. The National Guards marched about in military array, joining in the cry for vengeance which arose from all the Republican quarters of the city against the Prussians and against the government of M. Thiers, who was scornfully nicknamed *le Roi des Capitulards*.

In several places acts of violence were perpetrated. An unhappy police-agent was seized in the Place de la Bastille, and massacred under circumstances of atrocity. Some of the mutinous National Guards took possession of the dismounted cannon from the ramparts, and prepared to hold by force certain positions in the city, General Vinoy, who was in command of the small number of regular troops left within the walls, declining to interfere.

On Monday a proclamation was issued by MM. Thiers and Picard, previous to their departure the same evening for Bordeaux, appealing to the patriotism and self-restraint of the populace. "If the Convention be not respected," they said, "the armistice will be broken, and the enemy, already master of the forts, will occupy the entire city." To the same effect General Vinoy issued an order of the day; and he exhorted the loyal majority of the National Guards to preserve peace on the momentous occasion which impended.

These measures had a tranquillizing effect. All the journals, even the most Radical, advised that a calm dignity should be maintained when the hated entrance of the enemy should take place. It was resolved that the Bourse and the Theatres should be closed; that no newspapers should be issued; and that the Germans should find in the occupied quarters only silence, empti-

ness, and mourning. The authorities on their part took all possible precautions to prevent a collision between the conquerors and the vanquished. A cordon of troops was to be posted around the whole quarter of occupation. German soldiers wishing to visit the Louvre were to pass through the interior of the Tuileries. No omnibuses or cabs were to run within the guarded precincts; no shops to be open. Calmness and forbearance were earnestly counselled.

On the Tuesday Thiers and his colleagues arrived at Bordeaux, and met the Assembly in the afternoon. In the midst of the most profound silence Thiers rose and spoke as follows:—

“We have accepted a painful mission; and, after having used all possible endeavours, we come with regret to submit for your approval a Bill, for which we ask urgency. ‘Art. I. The National Assembly, forced by necessity, is not responsible, and adopts the Preliminaries of Peace signed at Versailles on the 26th of February.’”

At this point M. Thiers was overpowered by his feelings, and obliged to leave the room.

M. Barthélemy St. Hilaire continued to read the Preliminaries, interrupted only by occasional exclamations of grief from his auditors; after which, having referred the Bill to a Committee consisting of the fifteen delegates just returned from Paris, the Assembly adjourned the debates to the next day.

At noon on Wednesday, the 1st of March, the deputies met again in the Great Theatre, in which the Sessions of the Assembly, while at Bordeaux, were held. Deep emotion seemed to prevail. Many ladies clothed in mourning took their seats in the galleries. The proceedings began with the presentation of various protests against the cession of territory. Then M. Victor Lefranc read the Report which had been drawn up by the members of the Peace Commission lately sent to Paris; having finished which, he said that the Commission did not propose any alteration in the negotiations; that they had done every thing that was possible to ameliorate the conditions, and to avoid the grievous cession of territory; but they had to think of the situation of Paris, and the threats of the enemy, who had so cruelly forgotten the rights of the peoples. The occupation of Paris was also very grievous; but it was an inevitable calamity. He added, “The actual misfortunes we are suffering are the result of causes for which we are not answerable, but the honour of France is safe. . . If you refuse to accept these Preliminaries, Paris is occupied, and the whole of France will be invaded, and God only knows what disasters will ensue. We do not then counsel you to abandon yourselves to despair. Whatever may happen, France will retain her right of fulfilling her mission in the world. The Commission considers that in the present circumstances abstention from voting on the part of the members will be a desertion of duty, and an abdication of responsibility.”

The Assembly was much agitated.

M. Edgar Quinet and M. Bamberger then rose, and successively

counselled the rejection of the Preliminaries, M. Bamberger terminating his remarks by a violent attack on the late Emperor, whose name, he said, would be eternally nailed to the pillory of history.

This brought up the Corsican deputies, faithful to the traditions of the Bonaparte name. M. Conti, who had been chief of the Cabinet to Napoleon III., mounted the tribune amidst a storm of groans and hisses, and vainly endeavoured to make himself heard, while he lifted up his voice in defence of his late master. So great was the uproar that the President suspended the sitting for a quarter of an hour.

When the deputies met again, M. Target brought in a resolution, numerously signed, confirming the expulsion of Napoleon III. and his dynasty, and declaring him responsible for the ruin, invasion, and dismemberment of France. Almost the whole Assembly rose to acclaim this motion.

Conti and Gavini (another Corsican) demanded to speak, and the latter got into the tribune, and protested "*de toutes les forces de mon âme*" against the resolution.

"*Les Corses s'en mêlent,*" cried Gambetta from his place. These were the only words he spoke that afternoon.

"To the vote!" shouted the tumultuous Assembly, interrupting Gavini.

Then Thiers arose. "Gentlemen," he said, "I proposed to you a policy of conciliation and peace, and I hoped that all would understand our reserve with regard to the past. But when that Past, the cause of all our misfortunes, rears its head before the country, we resume our rights. Do you know, sir," he continued, addressing Conti or Gavini, "what those Princes say whom you represent? They say they are not the authors of this war, that it was France which would have it. *Eh bien ! je leur donne ici le démenti le plus formel.*" While urging the Assembly to close the incident as the wisest and most dignified course to adopt, he declared his respect for the courage of the Bonapartists, who thus stood forward to justify the master they had served. Finally, a vote was taken on Target's proposition. Six Deputies only remained seated ; all the rest rose to approve it by acclamation. The counter-proof, as it is called, being taken, those six rose stoutly to signify their dissent.

Victor Hugo then made a grand tirade against the cession of territory. He spoke with his accustomed force, imagination, and extravagance.

M. Louis Blanc, speaking on the same side, was more logical and impressive.

But no orator, had he been Demosthenes himself, would have altered the foregone resolution of the majority of Deputies that day. When the close of the debate was called for, the votes in favour of accepting the Preliminaries were 546 ; those against it, 107.

The voice of the veteran Changarnier was among those that counselled acquiescence. He said, "Verging to the end of a long life, and more infirm than I perhaps seem to be, I have preserved one strong passion—the love of my country. I shall be able once more to serve her by coming respectfully before this Assembly to advise the conclusion of peace."

The Ratifications of the Treaty of Peace were exchanged on Thursday, the 2nd, at Versailles.

A few days after, there was heard a protest from Wilhelmshöhe against the formal sentence of exclusion on the late ruler of France and his house. "In the presence of those mournful events, which impose upon all of us self-abnegation and disinterestedness, I would fain have kept silence,"—so wrote the captive Napoleon,—“but the declaration of the Assembly forces me to protest in the name of truth outraged, and the nation's rights abused.” His protest fell on careless ears.

The entry of the German troops into Paris took place, as arranged, at ten o'clock on the morning of March 1st, some battalions having come in earlier by two hours to occupy the Palais de l'Industrie in the Champs Elysées. The bridge from the Place de la Concorde to the Palais Législatif was barricaded and occupied by French Gensdarmes; so were the ends of the Rue Rivoli and the Rue Royale, and the line of the Rue St. Honoré. The Tuileries was shut up; but the Elysée was put at the disposal of General Kamecke, who commanded the in-coming forces. Crape veils covered the allegorical statues of French cities on the Place de la Concorde.

The morning dawned grey and cheerless; but early in the forenoon the sun broke through the mist and shone on the long lines of brass-pointed helmets, bayonets, and sabres, which advanced, skirting the Arc de Triomphe, up to the Place de la Concorde. The German Emperor stayed outside, at the Longchamps race-course, and inspected the troops previous to their entry. Bismarck, it was said, rode as far as the Arc de Triomphe, smoked his cigar contemplatively for a few minutes, then cantered back to Versailles to finish off business with the Bordeaux Assembly. Some of the Germans bivouacked that night in the gardens adjacent to the Place de la Concorde; some around the Arc de Triomphe. Among the surrounding populace a morose silence prevailed.

The following morning some excitement was manifest when the German soldiers, outstepping, as was said, their prescribed bounds, visited the Courts of the Louvre and the Carrousel, and the French soldiers on guard had to force back the angry people from the gratings. But the afternoon was bright; and when the intruders, returning to the "Quartier Prussien," began to dance and make music in the merriment of their spirits, the irresistible sight-seeing proclivities of the Parisian multitude drew them to the Place de la Concorde, to look on in sympathetic amusement. It was a great relief to the anxious authorities on both sides when Friday morning

beheld the invaders marching back,—this time through instead of round the Arc de Triomphe,—no mischief done, no collision brought to pass. The discipline and forbearance of the German troops on this occasion were indeed beyond all praise. As they left the Arch, and felt that all the labours of the war were really over, and that their next march was to be homewards, a ringing cheer burst from their lips, and all their helmets waved in the air. “It was the only occasion,” says an eye-witness, “on which I have seen the Germans indulge in military glorification. They fairly revelled in their triumph. . . . At exactly ten o’clock the procession came to an end. The last cheer had been given, the last helmet waved.”

On the 7th of March the Prussian head-quarters at Versailles finally broke up. The Emperor William stopped for a few days at Baron Rothschild’s chateau at Ferrières; Count Bismarck returned straight to Germany. The Imperial Crown Prince reviewed the Northern Army at Rouen on the 12th. The Crown Prince of Saxony was to be left in France at the head of the German army of occupation until a certain portion of the indemnity should be paid up.

CHAPTER II.

FRANCE.—Red Republican Party in Paris—Appropriation of the Cannon—Assembly at Bordeaux removes to Versailles—Revolution of March 18—Assassination of Generals Le Comte and Thomas—Central Committee and International Society—Origin of Communal Notions—Attitude of M. Thiers and the National Assembly—Massacre of the Place Vendôme—Communal Elections—Installation of the Paris Commune—Siege of Paris—Great Sortie—Death of Flourens—General Cluseret—Progress of the Siege—Internal Dissensions and Changes.—“Programme” of April 19—Finance of the Commune—Attempts at Mediation—Colonel Rossel—Delescluze—Entrance of Versailles Troops—Conquest of Paris—Conflagrations—Massacre of Hostages—Reprisals—End of the Commune.

AND now the affairs of this distracted country entered upon a new phase. The foreign enemy pacified, Government became aware that an enemy more formidable, because more fatal to all patriotic bonds of sympathy, existed in the heart of Paris. The Red Republican party, under the orders of a mysterious so-called “Central Committee,” had been organizing itself with alarming method and success in the quarters of Belleville, La Villette, and Montmartre. While the Prussian detachments remained within the walls of the capital they had preserved a prudent stillness, barricading their own precincts, and awaiting the course of events; but under pretext of placing the artillery in security from the national enemy,

they had laid hold of a large quantity of cannon and mitrailleuses, and removed them to positions of their own choosing. On the Place St. Pierre, at Montmartre, a formidable array was already parked, with the mouths of the pieces directed towards Paris.

On Monday, the 6th, great agitation was excited in the revolutionary quarter by the news that General d'Aurelle des Paladines had been appointed by Government to the command of the National Guard; but the first open outbreak was on the 9th, when an attempt was made by the Party of Order to replace the red flag on the top of the column in the Place de la Bastille by the tricolor. A party of sailors who attempted this feat were attacked by some of the disaffected National Guard, and thrown into prison. By this time the number of guns and of armed men on the side of the insurgents had vastly increased. Of the former they had more than 400 in their hands, of the National Guard not less than 100,000. The regular troops of the Government had by the last convention with the Germans, been raised to 40,000 men, but the authorities were very anxious to prevent a collision; and instead of the "vigorous steps" announced by General d'Aurelle des Paladines in his first proclamation, a negotiation was set on foot, and it was promised that if the cannon were given up, the National Guard should be continued on its present footing, with the payment of a franc and a half to each man till such time as ordinary work should be resumed. Then the forty-six cannon which were in the Place Royale were brought to the Place Wagram, and delivered over to the authorities. Not so the cannon on Montmartre. There a section of the National Guard, under the orders of its Committee, resolutely refused to comply unless the further demands for which they held out were granted—namely, the dismissal of Des Paladines, the unconditional right of the National Guard to choose its own officers, and the subordination of all military authority within the city to its municipal authorities. An ill-judged order of General Vinoy's on the 12th, suppressing the six foremost Radical journals, only served to exasperate the disaffection instead of intimidating it.

In view of the inflammatory state of feeling in the capital, it now became a question much debated in the Assembly at Bordeaux whether the centre of government and legislation should be transferred thither or not. Various places were proposed as preferable, on account of the greater freedom with which deliberations could be conducted. Blois, Tours, Fontainebleau, Orleans, were suggested. The Paris deputies did their utmost to maintain what they called the "rights of Paris, the only possible capital of France." However, on Friday, the 10th, it was voted by a majority of 461 to 104, that Versailles should be the selected spot, a previous motion in favour of Paris having been negatived by 427 to 154. M. Thiers, in the speech which he made on this occasion, appealed to the representatives of the two great parties to act

in concert for the work of reorganization. If the Assembly, he said, desired a permanent Republic, this was a matter which would entirely depend upon the Assembly itself. The Republic was in its hands. "For my own part," he said, "I vow before history that I will never deceive you; that I will never prejudge a question apart from you; that I will never act in any way so as to disown or betray your sovereignty."

In compliance with this decree, the Assembly met at Versailles on Monday, the 20th, eight days after the last body of Germans had marched out of the place. By that time very serious events had occurred in Paris.

On the previous Wednesday it had been decided at a Cabinet Council at Versailles, to appoint General Valentin Prefect of Police. A Council of Ministers and Generals was also held in Paris, to consider how to deal with those insurgent battalions which still refused to deliver up their cannon. The same evening a detachment of artillery, accompanied by a strong body of the Garde Républicaine, appeared on the Place des Vosges, with horses and harness prepared to carry off the cannon parked in that spot. The National Guard, however, formally refused to surrender them. Upon this, instead of enforcing the Government order, the commander of the troops quietly retired with his men. Early on the following morning detachments of National Guards came down from Belleville and dragged the cannon to the Buttes Chaumont. This was an overt act of defiance which could not be overlooked.

On Saturday morning (the 18th) a Government proclamation was placarded on the walls of Paris, to the effect that no attention having been paid by the insurgents to the counsels and injunctions of the ruling powers, notwithstanding the forbearance with which they had been treated, it was determined that action should be taken in the interest of Paris and of France.

Action had already begun. At four o'clock that morning strong detachments of cavalry and infantry, commanded by Generals Vinoy and Le Comte, had surrounded the Buttes Montmartre, and disarmed the sentinels who guarded the contested pieces. Had the cannon been carried off at that moment all might have been well. But here came a fatal want of forethought or of execution on the part of Government. The artillery destined to transport the cannon from the stronghold of the revolutionists, were two hours later on the spot than they ought to have been. During those two hours the Red Republicans had time to call together their forces from all parts of Montmartre; and when the tardily-arrived artillery began the work of harnessing, they found themselves obliged to give way. At the Place Pigalle a captain of chasseurs ordered his men to fire upon the National Guards. Scarcely, however, had he given the word of command, when the insurgents fired, and the officer was shot dead. The gendarmes present drew their swords, and prepared to charge; but the chasseurs suddenly disbanding, and the National Guards advancing at the same time, their movement was checked.

As they marched onwards the Reds met with no resistance; the infantry refused to fight, and raised the butt-ends of their rifles in the air; and the Gendarmes saw themselves compelled to withdraw. When they reached the Buttes a similar scene took place. In vain General Le Comte ordered his men to resist them. Up went the butt-ends of the muskets, and "Vive la République" was shouted from the ranks of "order." The general himself was surrounded, disarmed, and carried off to the Château Rouge, where he was placed in custody. General Vinoy, and those troops which had not joined the Reds, retreated into the interior of Paris. In the insurgent quarters the afternoon was spent in barricading all the streets leading down into Paris, and fortifying with cannon the Buttes Montmartre and Chaumont.

Among the onlookers at these proceedings happened to be General Clément Thomas, formerly Commander-in-Chief of the National Guards. He was recognized and seized; and his fate, and that of the unfortunate General Le Comte, who was dragged from his short imprisonment at the Château Rouge, were speedily decided. Under the orders of an Insurrectionary Committee, they were taken to a house in the Rue des Rosiers; and there the mob, without waiting for further trial or delay, insisted on their immediate execution. They were dragged into the garden of the house—first old General Thomas, then Le Comte,—and, with their backs to the wall, shot down by a body of National Guards.

In other quarters of Paris also the Red Republican agitation was carried on that afternoon. Barricades were thrown up in the Place de la Bastille and the Faubourg St. Antoine, and a party of the insurgents occupied the Caserne du Prince Eugène. The command of the National Guard was entrusted to Charles Lullier, an ex-naval officer, a young man of restless, frantic temperament. At about five o'clock the battalions of Montmartre descended from their heights, with drums and trumpets at their head, ostensibly to march upon the Hôtel de Ville, instead of which, however, they marched across the Seine to Montrouge. Simultaneously with this descent into the city, the news of the assassination of Generals Le Comte and Thomas became current, and excited general horror and indignation. Nevertheless, the population remained inactive: two proclamations of the Government, appealing to the National Guards, produced no effect; and the insurgents were allowed to do as they pleased. Among numerous other points secured by them was the Orleans Railway-Station, where during the evening General Chanzy, who was coming by that line from Tours, was arrested, and escorted through the city to the Château Rouge at Montmartre. On Sunday he was transferred to the Prison de la Santé.

At nine o'clock, another body of some 1500 men descended from Montmartre by the Rue Blanche, and marched immediately upon the Place Vendôme, which they found occupied by the gendarmes and National Guards. These retired upon their approach, and the Etat-Major of the National Guards was immediately taken posses-

sion of by the insurgents, as well as the Ministry of Justice. About an hour afterwards they installed themselves at the Hôtel de Ville, where during the night the Central Committee held a meeting. Early in the morning barricades were thrown up at all the streets leading on to the Place.

And now all the members of Government quitted Paris, some on Saturday evening, some on Sunday morning, taking with them the remaining Government forces. Before Sunday, the 19th of March, the whole of the city had been left to itself, and battalions of National Guards stood posted in different quarters. The Central Committee issued the following proclamation from the Hôtel de Ville :—

“Citizens,—The French people, until the attempt was made to impose upon it by force an impossible calm, has awaited without fear and without provocation the senseless and infamous men who wished evil to the Republic. This time our brothers of the army would not raise their hands against the arch of our liberties. Thanks to all, and that you and France have proclaimed the Republic, with all its consequences, to be the only Government which can close for ever the era of invasions and civil wars. The state of siege is raised. The people of Paris are convoked in their comitia for the communal elections. The security of all citizens is assured by the co-operation of the National Guard.

“The Central Committee of the National Guard :—Assi, Billioray, Ferrat, Cabric, Moreau, Dupont, Varlin, Boursier, Mortif, Zouher, Valette, Jourde, Rosseau, Sullier, Blanchet, Grallard, Baron Gerresme, Halse, Pougeret.

“Hôtel de Ville, March 19.”

A few hours after it was announced that the elections were to take place on the following Wednesday, the 22nd, and that the Central Committee was prepared to resign its power into the hands of the Commune, which should then be chosen as the true representative of the wishes and sentiments of the Parisians.

That same afternoon, the offices of the *Journal Officiel*, hitherto the organ of M. Thiers and the Assembly, were seized; and under the accustomed title, there appeared on Monday morning, besides the various Proclamations issued by the Central Committee, an address purporting to justify the acts of the new Paris Government, and condemning those of the opposite party; a proclamation to the departments, calling on them to imitate Paris; a declaration from the Committee, stating that Generals Le Comte and Thomas had been shot without their knowledge; and various notes raising the state of siege in the capital, suppressing Councils of War, according a full amnesty for all political crimes, and assuring liberty to the press. The staff and archives of the newspaper, however, had been removed to Versailles, and the two official journals thenceforth fulminated antagonistic articles and decrees. The offices of the *Figaro* and *Gaulois* were also invaded by National Guards on

Sunday; and the editors and writers having fled, seals were placed on the doors.

Such was the revolution of the 18th of March, or of the 27^e Ventose, An. 79, as the insurgents, in honour of former traditions, pleased themselves with calling it. It was a subject of remark and astonishment at the time, that of the names appended to the decrees of the revolutionary party, none were familiar to the public ear as connected with the previous movements of Red Republicanism. Blanqui, Flourens—both indeed lately condemned to death, *par contumace*, but known to be living in safe defiance of Government—Rochefort, Félix Pyat, editor of the *Vengeur*—such were the men who might have been supposed ready to take the foremost place in any aggression of the ultra-democratic party. But who were these—the men who now issued their mandates from the Hôtel de Ville, the men whom the battalions of Montmartre and Belleville implicitly obeyed?

The name of Assi was literally the only one that had hitherto caught the notice of the public ear. He was the leader in that strike at the Creuzot iron-works which had occurred in the spring of 1870. A Bremen man by birth it is said, a hard-headed, resolute artisan.

The power that had now risen to the real direction of affairs in Paris was one which had originated in social, not in political ideas; but it so happened that, owing to its effective organization and the clear-sightedness with which its leaders kept their aims in view, it had succeeded in appropriating and utilizing all other elements of revolutionary restlessness around it. Those elements during the later days of Imperialism in France were many. Though agreed in a general wish to upset the existing Government, the so-called Socialists and Red Republicans, as represented by Blanqui, by Félix Pyat, by Louis Blanc, by Delescluze, or by Rochefort, had various ideas of the Utopia that was to follow. More or less they marched in the track of the old Democratic notions of 1793, and aimed at establishing a system of political equality. But of late years a society had spread its ramifications throughout Europe, of which the principle was not primarily political, but social, revolution. The "International Working Men's Association" had been in organized existence since the year 1862. It was originally formed with the design to prevent needless competition among workmen, to regulate the conditions of strikes, to establish common interests among the working classes in different countries and states, and generally to amend their condition by all practicable and legal means. It was at a meeting in London, in 1864, that a new character—that of political action—became first imparted to it. The Conference at Lausanne, in 1866, bore this character still more strongly. In 1868 the French branch of the society underwent a prosecution by Government. Then it was that, for the first time, the names were mentioned of Assi, Duval, Varlin, and eight other members of the subsequent "Commune" of Paris. The wealth and influence of the society continuing to increase, its aims became

more distinctly revolutionary, and some of its advanced members before long announced that it aimed at the abolition of religion, the substitution of science for faith, of human justice for Divine justice, and the suppression of marriage; also at the direct legislation of the people by the people, the abolition of inheritance, and the constitution of land as collective property.

Now these views, not, as we have said, originally coming into the programme of the International, had been propagated for several years by the Socialist fanatics in France—by the party whose mixed and incongruous elements sprung out of the many varieties of popular dissatisfaction with which the country had abounded since 1848. The intervention of the “International,” and the organization and coherence which it gave both to practical Socialism and to theoretic or philosophical Communalism, was what made the Red Republican action of 1871 so formidable. The Empire, while it lasted, kept down these combined elements with a strong hand, but they sprung into activity the moment the Empire fell. The very day after the proclamation of the Republic, on the 4th of September, “committees of vigilance” were established by the Reds in the faubourgs, clubs were instituted, meetings were held, sections of the International were founded in all the quarters of Paris, incendiary speeches and threats were uttered in all directions. Their abortive attempts to overthrow the Government on the 31st of October and the 22nd of January, resulting in the imprisonment or outlawry of some of their leaders, had no deterring effect on the projects entertained by these formidable conspirators.

When the capitulation of Paris brought to an end the contest with the foreign foe, many causes combined to favour their designs. The capitulation itself, however inevitable, was a grand discredit to the actual rulers. Though the International Society was, by its original idea, independent of patriotic prejudices, yet the anti-Prussian cry was popular, and served their hour. The policy of Napoleon III. in seeking the support of his Empire from the rural population had helped to widen the separation of feeling and interests between the country and the town classes. The reactionary character of the Assembly at Bordeaux, its resolution not to sit at Paris, and the undisguised antipathy with which the members of the “Rural” party treated the Paris deputies who came to take their seats among them, tended to exasperate every hostile predisposition, and to impel the Parisians to claim without further delay the rights of self-government. Throughout the late siege cries had been heard from time to time for the “Commune,” but only a vague notion of municipal organization had been connected with the word. It now became evident that a new but definite theory of government had been thought out, and was about to be applied by the leaders of the insurrectionary movement. The subject of communal rights had for some time occupied the minds of political writers in France. In the early part of the century it was brought

forward as a reactionary theory, in opposition to the administrative principle introduced by the Revolution of 1793, when the old local demarcations of the country had been merged in symmetrical divisions, based on the proportions of population. Under Napoleon I. the local communes had crept back into a sort of quasi-recognition. Through the reigns of Louis Philippe and Napoleon III. various laws were passed, determining the rights of self-election or of Government appointment; and by dint of altered circumstances it came to pass that while the "Right," or Conservative party favoured the old revolutionary policy of centralization, the Liberals were mostly to be found on the platform of communal rights. So it was when 1870, with its great political convulsions, arrived. The Ultra Democrats of this time not only upheld the right of each separate municipality to a home-rule in all local matters, independent of interference from Government prefects; they deduced from their theory extreme consequences certainly undreamt of by its earlier advocates, and claimed that each commune and each province of the realm should have its own autonomy, and that their common union should be maintained only by a loose federal tie. It is said that Assi, the Creuzot workman, had made a special study of Italian mediæval history, and was enamoured of the vigour and freedom of Republican life as exhibited in the annals of Florence and her southern cities. The great fact which marked the *Communalist* movement of 1870-71 was its combination with the *Communist* ideas already rife among the working classes.

When the National Assembly held its first sitting at Versailles on the 20th of March, it was manifest that the temper of the majority was very bitter against the insurrection and its leaders. The Parisian deputies ventured on some conciliatory proposals; but the only action taken by Government was to remove General d'Aurelle des Paladines from the command of the National Guard, and appoint Admiral Saisset, the nominee of the mayors, in his place. The important week, from the 18th to the 25th, was wasted in grievous indecision. No doubt to the authorities at Versailles the situation was a most perplexing one. Whether it was better to crush the insurrection at once by the application of armed force, or to allay discontent by partial concession, was a question difficult to judge, except by the issue of facts. General Vinoy, though he had 40,000 men under arms, averred that he dared not answer for their steadiness when brought face to face with the disaffected National Guards. Still it was deeply to be regretted that at this juncture some consistent effort was not made to strengthen the partisans of "Order" within the city, for a considerable portion of the inhabitants were not by any means disposed to welcome the rule of their new would-be masters. Above 25 battalions of the National Guard, chiefly in the west and central districts, were ready to oppose the insurrection with arms, and only waited for orders and a plan of action. The representatives of all the best known journals signed a resolution repudiating the edicts of "the Committee located at the

Hôtel de Ville," and the *Journal des Débats* called upon its members to "retire quietly in face of the public indignation of Paris, which will not obey them." The system of requisitions to which the Central Committee now had recourse tended to enhance the discontent of the "Party of Order." The last funds of the Unionist Society, to the amount of 40,000*l.* sterling, having been withdrawn for use early in the week, the organizers of the movement were forced to seek other means of supply, and requisitions of bread from the bakers, of wine from the wine-shops, and of meat from the butchers, were enforced in exchange for receipts in the name of the Central Government.

On Tuesday afternoon the Men of Order ventured to make a demonstration. They marched, unarmed, through some of the principal thoroughfares; but, taking fright at the sight of a detachment of National Guards with bayonets, they dispersed ignominiously. On the following day, Wednesday, the 22nd, the demonstration was repeated. The ranks of Order collected at one o'clock in the Place de l'Opéra, and moved in a dense mass down the Rue de la Paix. Forcing back the first line of National Guards, they pressed on to the entrance of the Place Vendôme, when they were opposed by a double line of battalions from Belleville and Montmartre. Some of these threw the butt ends of their rifles in the air. Seeing this perilous symptom of fraternization, the commanders suddenly gave the order to fire. A volley was sent into the unarmed multitude, who instantly turned and fled, leaving thirty dead and wounded on the pavement. The fire was still directed on the fugitives as they fled up the Rue de la Paix and the adjoining streets. All the shops were closed. A universal panic then set in. The Reds remained masters of the day, and the Central Committee returned a vote of thanks to the National Guard for its services.

The mayors of the several arrondissements, acting partly, but not entirely, with the Paris deputies, had endeavoured to occupy a mediatory position between the Insurrectionary Committee and the National Assembly. They now positively refused, without the sanction of the last-named body, to execute the decrees of the Committee appointing the communal elections for that very Wednesday. The Central Committee submitted perforce to their postponement till four days later, the 26th; but employed the interval in trying to seize possession of such of the mairies as were not already in their power. Meanwhile, Admiral Saisset rallied round himself the friends of order and the loyal battalions of the National Guards, and the two parties—the "Blues" and the "Reds"—stood facing each other in the divided arrondissements. The Revolutionary Committee declared the absent Garibaldi their commander-in-chief; Lullier, the crack-brained ex-midshipman, being still at this time acting officer; and for some days Paris was as two hostile nations.

The prospect of actual war, however, frightened M. Thiers and his colleagues, and on the 24th an attempt at conciliation was made. Admiral Saisset issued a proclamation in the following terms:—

"Dear Fellow-Citizens,—I hasten to acquaint you that, in concert with the deputies of the Seine and the mayors of Paris, we have obtained from the Government of the National Assembly complete recognition of your municipal franchise and your right to elect all the officers of the National Guard, including the Commander-in-Chief, a modification of the law on the maturity of bills, and a bill on rent favourable to lodgers which includes rent to the amount of 1200f.

"Until you have confirmed my appointment or replaced me, I shall remain at my post of honour, to guard the execution of the laws of conciliation, which we have succeeded in obtaining, and thus contribute to the consolidation of the Republic."

The *Journal Officiel* of the Commune sneered. "The Assembly," it said, "applauded M. Thiers when, with solemnity, he let fall from the height of the tribune of the Theatre these words of insurrection, 'We shall not parley with the *émeute*.' To-day he sends Admiral Saisset to parley!"

For a few hours it was fondly believed by the inhabitants of Paris that the civil strife was at an end. But the flattering dream was short. At the last moment the negotiations for peace broke down. MM. Schoelcher, Floquet, Lockroy, Clémenceau, and other Parisian deputies imputed the miscarriage to the opposition of the National Assembly; but the Government averred that the demands of the insurgents increased with the prospect of concession. Not content with the election of a Communal Council, which had been promised, they asked that the Council should supersede the Assembly wherever the rival jurisdictions might happen to come into collision, and that it should take possession of the Bank and control the finances. The Ministry refused these enhanced terms, and Paris relapsed at once into the condition it had endured for eight days.

On Saturday the baffled Admiral declared his mission to be at an end, dismissed the battalions of order, and made his way to Versailles on foot, whither the next day he was followed by General Chanzy, whose release from prison had been accorded by the Central Committee.

The communal elections took place on Sunday, the 26th. The proceedings were calm and orderly enough; and as a large proportion of the inhabitants—the rich and "respectable"—abstained from voting, the victory of the Reds was easy. It was calculated that about 200,000 voted in all, of whom 140,000 were for the Committee's nominees, and 60,000 for those of their opponents. The number of candidates elected should have been 95; but from one cause or another only 80 were forthcoming, and of these 24 declined to serve. Subsequently, in the middle of April, there was a supplementary election to fill the vacancies. At the head of all the Committee's lists stood the name of the absent Blanqui, who, with Assi, Flourens, Félix Pyat, and other well-known Reds, was duly returned to serve on the new governing body. Blanqui, though generally supposed at first to have been the head and soul

of the Communist insurrection, never appeared on the central stage of events from the beginning to the end of its success. Some imagined that he was living in mysterious retirement on Montmartre, and worked the innermost wheels of the secret committees. The fact was, however, that as soon as the success of the insurrection seemed secured, Blanqui had left Paris with the intention of propagating the revolt in other cities of the kingdom, but was arrested at St. Etienne by the authorities, and thrown into prison. The mission to the provincial cities was taken up by other agents of the revolution, with the view of establishing a federal system, with Paris at the head. Disturbances ensued accordingly at Lyons, Marseilles, Rouen, and other towns; but their prevalence was partial and of short duration, and the fire kindled in the metropolis did not cause any formidable conflagration beyond its own precincts. Lyons, however, secured itself in the possession of a certain communal independence, and continued to wave the Red flag after the Paris revolt was over.

As soon as the Paris Commune was elected the Central Committee, in the name of the "Universal Republic," formally abdicated in its favour; but as twenty out of its thirty-seven members were on the list of the new rulers, and as there still remained a "Sub-Committee" and a "Secret Committee," whose functions were somehow obscurely blended with those of the ostensible administration, it would hardly seem that the transfer of authority was more than a change of name. Those deputies for Paris whose names appeared on the Commune's list resigned their functions in the Assembly. It was decided that the two characters were henceforth incompatible.

The ceremony of installation took place on the afternoon of Tuesday, the 28th, when the Commune was proclaimed with music and cannon on the Place Hôtel de Ville, in presence of the elected members, who sat in red arm-chairs on a platform, beside a bust representing the Republic, and crowned with the Phrygian cap of liberty. A grand banquet followed, and the evening closed with festal rejoicings at Belleville and Montmartre.

In the organization which now took place, Delescluze, who possessed the most statesmanlike head among the citizens thus borne upward to the surface of the political stream, is said to have had the chief hand. Nine committees were elected out of the Commune to preside over the nine different departments of government. By these committees delegates were again elected to act as the Ministerial body of the Commune. Cluseret was appointed Delegate of War; Jourde, of Finance; Paschal Grousset, of Foreign Affairs; Raoul Rigault, of General Safety. The power of originating measures seems at first to have been vested in the Executive Committee, on which stood the names of Felix Pyat and Delescluze.

As soon as the new Government was installed, a long list of decrees appeared in the pages of the *Journal Officiel*. By one the Conscription was abolished. It was decreed that no central force,

with the exception of the National Guard, should be created or introduced into Paris. All able-bodied citizens were bound to form a part of the National Guard. By another decree a general remission of rents was granted to lodgers from October, 1870, till April, 1871, and the amounts already paid during those months were to be placed to future credit. The sale of all articles deposited at the Mont de Piété was suspended. All public officers and *employés* were henceforth to consider the authority of the Government at Versailles as null and void, on penalty of dismissal.

The symptoms of a desperate struggle were now rife, and the outward aspect of Paris bore evidence of the general uneasiness and suspense. On the streets and boulevards few carriages were to be seen. The cafés and restaurants were deserted. It is calculated that during the last ten days of March not less than 160,000 persons quitted the capital. The majority of those who remained, small tradesmen and artisans, were favourable rather than otherwise to a resolution which promised to relieve them from some of their financial burdens, or to increase their actual gains; others, especially the gentry of limited means, who could not well abandon their homes, found acquiescence the only policy it was safe to pursue.

At Versailles a steady concentration of troops was going on. The German authorities, willing to facilitate the task of the National Assembly, permitted the increase of the stipulated number of 40,000 regular troops to double that amount, affording at the same time every facility for the return of the prisoners of Metz and Sedan. But the German attitude caused anxiety, especially when on the 23rd Jules Favre announced to the Assembly that Count Bismarck had complained of certain acts of destruction in Paris,—notably the cutting of the telegraph wire at Pantin—as infringements of the Treaty of Peace, which might possibly necessitate the return of the late garrison to the forts they had ceased to occupy, and the resumption of warlike operations against the city. Meanwhile the German forts on the north and east maintained a watchful attitude: the batteries were re-armed, and the outlying troops of occupation concentrated.

At the close of March all was prepared for a new chapter in the fates of France; the siege of Paris by the French; a contest whose fratricidal character made it the more bitter, tragic, portentous.

The first military movement of the siege took place on the morning of Sunday, the 2nd of April. A division of the Versailles army, 10,000 strong, advanced in two columns upon Courbevoie, and at about 10 o'clock a.m. came in collision with 2000 National Guards posted there by the Commune. A controversy was afterwards raised as to which party fired the first shot in this new Civil War. The Communists said that the Versailles troops fired first, and killed one of their officers. The Versaillists asserted that a *parlementaire* on their own side, a doctor, had been treacherously shot by a National Guard. However this might be, the fusillade soon

became hot. The Communists were worsted, and, after one or two rallies, withdrew into Paris by the Pont de Neuilly, and shut the gates. The prisoners who fell into the hands of the Versaillists were summarily executed; and the result of this first encounter was to raise to a pitch of fearful intensity the hatred with which the Government of M. Thiers was regarded by the fanatics who dreamt of a millennium of universal concord from the triumph of their own doctrines. M. Thiers did not feel sure enough of his troops to venture on following up his success; accordingly they retired from the Pont de Neuilly to the adjacent villages. The decisive march on Paris was to be put off till he should have secured by further compliance on the part of the Germans, and by the arrival of more veterans from the late forces of Bazaine and M'Mahon, a force much more imposing than that which he had at present under his orders.

The Parisians did not wait for him to take the initiative. All the night of the 2nd the *rappel* was beaten in the city, and as soon as it was ascertained that the foe had fallen back, an immense sortie was organized, to converge upon Versailles from the west and south-west of the *enceinte*. The cooler heads among the insurgent rulers were adverse to this design. It was carried through by some of the more headstrong spirits, by Bergeret and Duval—both prominent members of the Commune, and now in military command, though one was by calling a journeyman printer, and the other a prompter at a minor theatre—and by the notorious Gustave Flourens. The number of National Guards who presented themselves for the service were calculated at nearly 100,000. It was confidently anticipated that on their approach the “regulars” of Versailles would open their arms and join them. It was also believed by those who planned the movement that the Governor of Mont Valérien was secretly on their side, and that he would declare himself, or at all events keep his guns silent while their forces passed his stronghold. The forts of Issy and Vanves, on the south side of Paris, were already in their possession.

The right wing, commanded by General Bergeret, commenced its march at half-past six in the morning. The Versailles troops, who occupied the Bridge of Neuilly, fell back at its approach; and the National Guards marched on, exulting, to the Rond Point of Courbevoie. Here they divided, one portion keeping to the high road, the other following the course of the railway to Nanterre and Bougival. When approaching Buzenval, these last were encountered by General Vinoy with some detachments of the “regulars:” at the same time the Marquis de Gallifet, advancing from Malmaison with his cavalry brigade, took them in flank. At sight of the hostile forces the troops of the Commune wavered and dispersed; and while trying to make good their retreat, the guns of Mont Valérien, in whose silence they had rashly confided, opened upon them with dire effect. 15,000 of them got past Valérien, and made their way to Rueil, with Gustave Flourens at their head. Finding his detach-

ment isolated, Flourens was proceeding to make arrangements for the occupation of the village, when a company of Gendarmes suddenly appeared, and surrounded him. The situation was desperate; Flourens drew his revolver and fired on his assailants. But he was speedily shot down. Of his followers some fled, the rest were taken or cut to pieces. His body was placed on a cart and taken to Versailles. Thus ended, at the early age of thirty-two, the most vehement and pertinacious of the agitators who had held sway over the popular mind since the day of Victor Noir's funeral.

The centre column of the insurgents, under General Eudes, advanced at six o'clock a.m. towards Meudon. In the valley of Bellevue, it was received by a volley of musketry from the woods, and by shells from the batteries of Meudon. Panic and dispersion immediately took place, and the fugitives sheltered themselves under the walls of Fort Issy. Here they were joined by large reinforcements, and proceeded to reform. A second time they advanced, and a second time they were driven behind Fort Issy, which kept up an artillery duel with Meudon till half-past seven in the evening. Then all was quiet in that quarter.

The left column, commanded by General Duval, took possession, at five o'clock in the morning, of the undefended plateau of Châtillon, passed above Fontenay les Roses, and arrived at the Petit Bicêtre. Here, however, the Communists were sharply assailed by artillery from the woods of Verrières and of Meudon, and, unable to advance farther, commenced at one o'clock their retreat. Before the day closed they had left the plateau and concentrated themselves behind the redoubt of Châtillon. Night brought them reinforcements; and on Tuesday the 4th the battle was renewed on the Plateau of Châtillon, a vehement counter-fire being carried on between the batteries of the Versailles army and the insurgent forts of Issy, Vanves, and Montrouge. The firing continued all through Wednesday. Next day the Versailles troops pushed upon Courbevoie, and the National Guards fell back. By the 7th, Good Friday, they had abandoned all defence of the Pont de Neuilly, in front of which the troops of the Assembly proceeded to establish a battery. Thus the sortie had resulted in a complete failure, and the revolutionists of Paris were reduced henceforth to defend themselves within their walls. A new phase of the struggle set in. The horrors of a bombardment, which the friends of France had dwelt upon as the acme of cruelties when inflicted by the Germans, were now to be liberally dealt out by Frenchmen to their brethren; and mutual hatred increased accordingly. The public burning of the Guillotine in the Place Voltaire on the 7th of April, by order of the Commune, was indeed ostensibly a tribute to the spirit of humanity, and it must be owned that at this time the would-be regenerators of the world were far from showing indications of the blood-thirsty spirit that had characterized the former Reign of Terror. But the influences that were at work on their minds, especially the exasperation caused by the fate of General Duval,

who had fallen alive into the hands of the Versaillists in the late encounter, and had been shot at once by order of Vinoy, were evident in the following proclamation issued on the 5th :—

“Citizens,—Every day the banditti of Versailles slaughter or shoot our prisoners, and every hour we learn that another slaughter has been committed. Those who are guilty of such crimes—you know them—those are the Gendarmes of the Empire, the Royalists of Charette and Cathélineau, who are marching on Paris, and shouting “Vive le Roi,” and with a white flag at their head. The Government of Versailles is acting against the laws of warfare and humanity, and we shall be compelled to make reprisals should they continue to disregard the usual conditions of warfare between civilized peoples. If our enemies murder a single one of our soldiers we shall reply by ordering the execution of an equal number, or double the number of prisoners. The people, even in its anger, detests bloodshed as it detests civil war, but it is its duty to protect itself against the savage attempts of its enemies, and whatever it may cost, it shall be an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth.

“(Signed) The Commune of Paris.”

On the sixth day after this decree appeared, the Archbishop of Paris was placed under arrest, with his two Grand Vicars, and carried off to the prison of the Conciergerie, from whence, two or three days later, he was transferred to that of Mazas, and eventually to that of La Roquette. Several curés of the Paris churches, and M. Bonjean, President of the Court of Cassation, were also arrested; and it was announced that these and others, amounting to some 200 in all, should be kept as hostages for the good treatment of the Communist prisoners by their enemies. There was indeed good reason to fear what this treatment might be. The Marquis de Gallifet, one of the most energetic of the Versaillist officers, announced simultaneously in an order of the day: “War has been declared by the bandits of Paris. Yesterday, the day before, and to-day they have assassinated my soldiers. It is a war without truce or pity I wage against those assassins. I do not forget that the country and the law, and, consequently, right, are with Versailles and the National Assembly, and not with the grotesque Assembly at Paris which calls itself the Commune.”

Why did not M. Thiers order an immediate assault upon Paris? it was asked by many at this juncture. It could not be questioned that the regular troops had shown their great superiority over the National Guards, nor had any symptoms of a wish to fraternize with these last been discernible. Still Thiers’ policy was to wait and prepare. He would leave nothing to chance. His delay, whether wise or not, as regarded the exigencies of his own position, undoubtedly gave renewed hope to the Commune. A man of no mean ability was now available for their help. General Cluseret, a Frenchman naturalized in America, who had led a life of adventure

beyond the Atlantic, and had headed the Red revolt at Marseilles during the latter part of the preceding year, was appointed Minister of War. With more unfettered powers than had yet been accorded to any officers of the revolt—powers which his ambitious nature seemed not unlikely to turn into a dictatorship, Cluseret began at once to reorganize the National Guard. He issued a decree by which at first all unmarried citizens from seventeen to thirty-five years of age were incorporated into the marching battalions. This he altered, however, making service compulsory on married and unmarried alike from nineteen to forty. All National Guards who did not perform their routine of duty were to be disarmed and deprived of their pay. On the other hand, the Commune ordered pensions to the wounded, and to the widows and children of the slain. In reorganizing the National Guard, Cluseret adopted a new principle. Instead of keeping each battalion a separate unit, which had the effect of maintaining a certain spirit of antagonism between them, some inclining to the cause of "order," and some to the insurrection, he reverted to the old system of legions which existed before 1851. Each of the twenty Arrondissements was to furnish a legion, or congeries of battalions, commanded by its colonel; the average of each legion being estimated at nominally 15,000, but really 10,000, allowing for the number of inhabitants who had quitted Paris. Measures were taken to introduce a stricter discipline among the troops. It was determined that in each legion there should be a Council of War, and in each battalion a Council of Discipline. The union of all the legions constituted what was called the "Federation of the National Guard of Paris." Subsequent experience tended to show that the enforced military service, which was the foundation of Cluseret's reform, contributed more than any thing else to the downfall of the Commune, by enlisting half-hearted or treacherous soldiers in the cause. Next, an important scientific reform was introduced into the principle on which barricades were to be constructed. The Commission appointed to act in this matter was presided over by Louis Nathaniel Rossel, a young officer, twenty-seven years of age, now acting as Cluseret's aide-de-camp, who had formerly belonged to the army of Metz, then had been appointed to a command by Gambetta, and whose indignation at Bazaine's surrender, and subsequently at the Capitulation of Paris, had induced him, as he afterwards averred, to throw in his lot with the Commune, because he believed the ascendancy of the party of Revolution would best subserve the cherished passion of his heart, the desire to drive the Prussian invaders out of his country. In place of General Bergeret, who had been placed under arrest after his defeat on the 3rd of April, the post of Commandant of Paris was given to Ladislaus Dombrowski, a Pole, a soldier of fortune, clever, daring, and reckless, who fought for the love of fighting, not from political convictions of any kind.

Marshal M'Mahon had consented at Thiers' request to take command of the troops for the National Assembly. He arrived at

Versailles, and was installed in his office on the 8th of April. A steady influx of soldiers, late prisoners, was now pouring in from Germany. These had to be organized and disciplined afresh; and Thiers, though forced to an appearance of activity in order to keep up the spirits of his army, was still resolved to make no great effort till he had amassed the 150,000 fighting-men which the German authorities had now consented to allow him. Consequently, the military operations for the next four or five weeks present no very varied or striking features, and the principal results may be enumerated in a brief summary. On the 11th of April, 15,000 Versailles troops attacked the southern forts, and were repulsed by 80,000 Federalists under General Eudes. The next day 3000 Gendarmes crossed the Seine on the n.w. of the city, and were driven back by Dombrowski. These successes were magnified by the Parisians, and for a short time Dombrowski became the popular hero. But the Versailles party treated them as utterly unimportant, and had soon their rival triumph to boast in the capture of Château de Becon and Asnières, on the 17th and 19th, in spite of Dombrowski, by Colonel Davoust. In the meanwhile the siege-works were steadily advanced. On the 25th, there was a suspension of hostilities on the n.w. side of Paris, in order to enable the wretched inhabitants of the bombarded villages lying between the Seine and the ramparts of the city to retire to one side or the other, carrying with them such property as they could save. It was granted for a few hours only, as Thiers was resolved not in any way to recognize the belligerent *status* of the Communists. As soon as the stipulated interval had expired, three great batteries opened fire on Forts Vanves and Issy. The investment was now declared complete, and a general expectation was entertained that the decisive assault would be made. But this was not to be yet. The bombardment was doing its work effectively. Daily the National Guards were growing more weary and disheartened. On the 1st of May the Versaillists obtained some successes of a somewhat more marked character. A battalion of General Vinoy's Army of Reserve carried at the point of the bayonet the railway-station at Clamart, massacring without quarter 300 of the insurgents. Three more battalions at the same time advanced on the Château of Issy, and captured it, again with cruel slaughter. On the 3rd, the redoubt of Moulin Saquet was taken by General Lacretelle, with eight pieces of cannon and more than 300 prisoners.

By the end of the first week in May, no less than 128 batteries were in action against the besieged city. After a warning proclamation from Thiers, seven of these, which had been constructed at Montretout, opened fire with great effect against the Communist defences at the Point du Jour. On the same day, Fort Issy was taken, with 109 guns, the insurgents evacuating it under cover of the night. This was the most decisive success the besiegers of Paris had yet obtained. Fort Vanves took fire, and had also to be evacuated for a time; but it was subsequently re-entered by the

insurgents, and occupied by them till the 14th. On the 12th of May, Marshal M'Mahon issued a proclamation to his soldiery, summing up the results of the siege :—"The country," he said, "applauds your successes, and sees in them a presage of the end of the struggle which we all deplore. Before long we shall plant the National Flag upon the ramparts, and obtain the re-establishment of that Order which is called for, not only by France, but all Europe. Soldiers ! you have well deserved the gratitude of the country." Two days afterwards, the tri-colour flag waved over Fort Vanves. The garrison, finding this stronghold no longer tenable, made their escape by a subterranean passage communicating with Montrouge, leaving 50 guns and 8 mortars behind them.

By this capture the s.w. front of the *enceinte* was deprived of the last of its outlying defences, and the long-threatened breach in the walls of Paris became a near and easy certainty to the besiegers.

Within the walls of Paris by this time all was in a state of rapid disorganization. Jealousy and distrust had made fatal inroads into the ranks both of the Commune and of the Central Committee, which still wielded its mysterious authority behind the ranks of the ostensible rulers. Arrests became frequent, as one prominent personage after another seemed to the eyes of his colleagues to acquire too much of the character of a dictator, or was suspected of leanings to the cause of moderation. The disgrace and temporary imprisonment of Lullier and of Bergeret was followed by that of Assi. Delescluze next, by dismissal from his office, paid the penalty of his statesman-like self-restraint, while the dangerous Ranc carried the Jacobin ultras with him, but prudently anticipated his own turn of disgrace by retiring from public life before the end of April. General Cluseret retained his authority as Minister of War throughout that month. Then he too was suddenly dismissed and arrested—it was said on account of the capture of Fort Issy, but inklings of systematic treachery were supposed to be the real cause—and his young aide-de-camp, Rossel, succeeded to the post, for which it was surmised he had been eagerly intriguing.

On the 1st of May, simultaneously with the disgrace of Cluseret, another variety was introduced into the machinery of government by the appointment of a "Committee of Public Safety," named in memory of the traditions of the old Republic, and intended apparently to supersede the authority of all existing delegates and committees. But this institution, though the restless Félix Pyat was one of its leading members, proved a failure; and the old Central Committee continued to exercise the main direction of affairs, resuming the power which Cluseret had endeavoured to transfer to the body of delegates. The multiplication and confusion of authorities at this time showed the childish incompetence of the leaders of the revolution to carry out the task which they had taken upon their shoulders. To organize a Working Men's Association, or a Federation of National Guards, was one thing; to govern a great city as an independent and at the same time belli-

gerent state, was another; and the checks and counter-checks, with which jealousy or personal vanity were continually clogging the wheels of public action, operated no less fatally than the cannon of the Versaillists to break up the short-lived dominion of the Paris Commune.

Nevertheless, whatever may be said of their practical incoherencies, it has been allowed, even by the enemies of the Commune, that the programme which they put forth on the 19th of April was a clear, straightforward, and able exposition of the plans and objects which their political and social revolution professed to have in view. We quote the most important portion of this document.

“It is the duty of the Commune to confirm and determine the aspirations and wishes of the people of Paris; to explain, in its true character, the movement of March 18th—a movement, which has been up to this time misunderstood, misconstrued, and calumniated by the politicians at Versailles. Once more Paris labours and suffers for the whole of France, for whom she is preparing, by her battles and her devoted sacrifices, an intellectual, moral, administrative, and economic regeneration—an era of glory and prosperity.

“What does she demand?”

“The recognition and consolidation of the Republic as the only form of government compatible with the rights of the people, and the regular and free development of society; the absolute independence of the Commune and its extension to every locality in France; the assurance by this means to each person of his rights in their integrity, to every Frenchman the full exercise of his faculties and capacities as a man, a citizen, and an artificer. The independence of the Commune will have but one limit—the equal right of independence to be enjoyed by the other Communes who shall adhere to the contract. It is the association of these Communes that must secure the unity of France.

“The inherent rights of the Commune are these:—The right of voting the Communal Budget of receipts and expenditure, of regulating and reforming the system of taxation, and of directing local services; the right to organize its own magistracy, the internal police and public education; to administer the property belonging to the Commune; the right of choosing by election or competition, with responsibility and a permanent right of control and revocation, the Communal magistrates and officials of all sorts; the right of individual liberty under an absolute guarantee, liberty of conscience and liberty of labour; the right of permanent intervention by the citizens in Communal affairs by means of the free manifestation of their ideas, and a free defence of their own interests, guarantees being given for such manifestations by the Commune, which is alone charged with the duty of guarding and securing the free and just right of meeting and of publicity; the right of organizing the urban defences and the National Guard, which is to elect its own chiefs and alone provide for the maintenance of order in the cities.

"Paris desires no more than this, with the condition, of course, that she shall find in the Grand Central Administration, composed of delegates from the Federal Communes, the practical recognition and realization of the same principles. To insure, however, her own independence, and as a natural result of her own freedom of action, Paris reserves to herself the liberty of effecting as she may think fit, in her own sphere, those administrative and economic reforms which her population shall demand, of creating such institutions as are proper for developing and extending education, labour, commerce, and credit; of popularizing the enjoyment of power and property in accordance with the necessities of the hour, the wish of all persons interested, and the *data* furnished by experience. Our enemies deceive themselves or deceive the country when they accuse Paris of desiring to impose its will or its supremacy upon the rest of the nation, and of aspiring to a dictatorship which would amount to a veritable attack against the independence and sovereignty of other Communes. They deceive themselves or the country when they accuse Paris of seeking the destruction of French unity as established by the Revolution. The unity which has hitherto been imposed upon us by the Empire, the Monarchy, and the Parliamentary Government, is nothing but a centralization, despotic, unintelligent, arbitrary, and burdensome. Political unity as desired by Paris is a voluntary association of each local initiative, a free and spontaneous co-operation of all individual energies with one common object—the wellbeing, liberty, and security of all. The Communal Revolution initiated by the people on the 18th of March, inaugurated a new political era, experimental, positive, and scientific. It was the end of the old official and clerical world, of military and bureaucratic *régime*, of jobbing in monopolies and privileges, to which the working class owed its state of servitude, and our country its misfortunes and disasters."

The financial position of the insurrectionary government was now a matter demanding serious consideration.

On the 2nd May, M. Jourde, the Delegate of Finance, presented his official report to his colleagues. He informed them that the receipts of the Commune having reached to nearly twenty-six millions, and the expenses to about twenty-five millions, there now remained in the Treasury a reserve of about 800,000 francs. The receipts had been made up by *octrois*, by the duty on tobacco, by payments in advance of direct taxes, by numerous loans from the Bank of France, by the sale of valuable church articles, by the tax levied on railways, and by the confiscation of the funds belonging to the International Society for Aid to the Wounded, which last violent measure had been carried out by order of General Cluseret on the 14th of April. The expenditure was caused by the pay of the National Guard, reckoned at 190,000 men, receiving, some two and a half, and some one and a half francs *per diem*, besides the pay of officers and special corps, the pay and maintenance of the members of the Commune and of other public bodies, with various petty charges besides. It

was necessary to find ways and means to meet the exigencies of the public; and among other projects of confiscation started at this time for supplying the coffers of the city—while at the same time it was designed to gratify the fantastic sentimentality of the Paris revolutionists—was the proposed destruction of the Column erected to the memory of Napoleon I. in the Place Vendôme, and the utilization of the metal of which it was composed. The idea was started early in April, but its execution was several times postponed, and it was not finally carried into effect till the afternoon of the 16th of May; when, amidst the acclamations of a vast crowd, and in presence of some of the members of the Government, this famous monument of the martial glories, once the pride of the fickle Parisian multitude, under the strain of ropes attached, bowed heavily towards the Rue de la Paix, then toppled over, shivering into fragments. The statue of the conqueror, by which it was surmounted, broke from its pedestal, and was kicked and spit upon by the zealous devotees of cosmopolitan fraternity, to whose principles his career had been so unquestionable an outrage. Two days previously, in accordance with a decree of the Commune, the private house of M. Thiers, in the Place St. George, had been demolished, and his valuable collection of pictures, books, and statues confiscated. In nothing did the Commune belie its own boasted doctrines of liberty more signally than in the treatment it accorded to the public journals. One after another was proscribed as its utterances became displeasing to the authorities; and the last decree of suppression by the Second Committee of Public Safety on the 19th of May left hardly any independent newspapers alive. On that day Henri Rochefort quitted Paris in disguise, saying that in the present condition of the press his own noted journal, the *Mot d'Ordre*, no longer deigned to appear. As his ill luck would have it, this restless but not very valiant hero of Red Republicanism, instead of reaching a place of safety, however, fell into the hands of the Versaillists, and great was the exultation in the hostile camp when he was brought in a prisoner through their streets.

The vile *Père Duchesne* was one of the few journals permitted to live, and it was a worthy organ of the low class of demagogues who were now influencing the hour, and of whom Raoul Rigault, the Public Prosecutor, and his subordinate Ferré, acquired in the course of events the most sinister celebrity.

We must here take notice of some attempts that were made during part of the months of April and May to bring about an understanding between the hostile powers. A moderate party had organized itself in the insurgent ranks, consisting of a few mayors and deputies deposed by the Commune, some citizens of known democratic opinions, and three of the representatives of Paris still in the Assembly. These called themselves the "Republican League for the rights of Paris," and they waited on M. Thiers on the 12th of April, with proposals for the concession of the chief civic rights claimed by the capital, in return for her consent to lay down arms

and remain a portion of the French nationality. Thiers's answer was not encouraging. The Commune at once interpreted it as a refusal of its demands, and so informed the League. That body, however, did not cease from endeavouring to bring about a compromise, and the armistice of the 25th was owing to its mediation between the almost equally reluctant parties. The Society of Freemasons made an elaborate effort at conciliation at the close of the month, and at one time success seemed very nearly crowning the endeavours of a delegation sent from Lyons. The point upon which M. Thiers proved obdurate was the refusal to accord the full municipal franchises claimed by Paris, claimed also by the other democratic cities of France, of which Lyons was one. He had already given proof of his strong determination on this subject on the 14th of April, when the Assembly at Versailles having, by an unexpectedly liberal vote, conceded the right of every city to choose its own mayor, Thiers had peremptorily interfered, threatening instant resignation unless the decision was revoked with regard to every town having more than 20,000 inhabitants. The Assembly obeyed him, thereby procuring for the disposal of the Central Government all the important mayoralties in the kingdom. M. Thiers now declared to the Lyons delegates that the law ultimately passed on that occasion was sufficiently liberal, and that he could allow no further step whatever in the path of decentralization.

Colonel Rossel, the new War Delegate, began his administration with an attempt to reorganize the National Guards. By several decrees, dated "the 15th Floreal of the year 79," he established different military commands. Dombrowski, at Neuilly, was to conduct personally the operations on the right bank of the river; La Cecilia, an Italian volunteer, with the title of Commandant of the Centre, was to conduct the military operations between the Seine and the left bank of the Bievre; the Pole Wroblewski, to command the left wing; Bergeret to command one brigade, Eudes the other, of the field-reserve. Rossel then appointed a review for the 9th of May. For the moment he was the popular hero. Men likened him in outward aspect to Napoleon I. His youth, his military talent, his modest bearing, his Spartan simplicity of life, were all themes of admiration. But had this young officer's genius been as great as it was fondly supposed to be, the system of divided powers which the distrust of Government insisted on, would have effectually hampered it. Of the 12,000 National Guards he had summoned to his review, only 7000 made their appearance. All his orders were interfered with. Within a week of his acceptance of office he found the terms intolerable, and sent in his resignation to the Commune.

"Charged by you," he said, "with the provisional title of the Delegate of War, I feel myself incapable of any longer supporting the responsibility of a commandant where every one wishes to deliberate and no one to obey. When it became necessary to organize the artillery, the Central Committee of Artillery deliberated and decided nothing. After two months of revolution the service of your cannon depends

on the energy of a few volunteers insufficient for their work. . . . My predecessor committed the fault of struggling in the midst of this absurd situation. Enlightened by his example, knowing that the force of a revolutionist only consists in a situation clearly defined, I have two lines to choose between—to break the obstacle which hampers my action, or to withdraw. I shall not break the obstacle, for that obstacle is you and your weakness; I will make no attempt on the public sovereignty. I retire, and have the honour to demand a cell at Mazas. (Signed) ROSSEL.”

He was arrested, but managed immediately afterwards to escape, in company with the guard who had been placed to watch him.

True indeed at this time was that which Rochefort had said in his paper the *Mot d'Ordre*: “It is neither dread of the Prussians nor of the shells of M. Thiers, which enervates Paris and kills our hopes; it is gaunt suspicion that weighs us down. The Hôtel de Ville distrusts the Minister of War, who distrusts the Minister of Foreign Affairs. The Fort of Vanves distrusts Montrouge, Montrouge distrusts Bicêtre; Rigault distrusts Rossel, and Rossel distrusts Dombrowski.”

In its perplexity the Commune turned for a successor in the War ministry to Delescluze. When the veteran took possession of his new office, he did it with a despairing heart. He saw that the insurrection was doomed to perish; and honest and sincere in his own radical convictions, he had resolved to perish with it. A civilian himself, Delescluze was little acquainted with military matters, but he felt that the one chief requisite of his party was union of its members among themselves, and to this he exhorted them in grave and earnest words.

We now reach the last stage of the siege. Fort Vanves, as has been stated, was taken on the 14th of May. By this capture the s.w. front of the *enceinte* was deprived of the last of its outlying defences. To the north and east stood the grim barrier of the German forces, ready to bar any attempt at egress on the part of the penned-up inhabitants. A well-drilled army was lying encamped against the city in the Bois de Boulogne. The spirits of the Versaillists rose to a high pitch. Still Marshal M'Mahon was looking forward to at least six days more of sapping and mounting of batteries and actual breaching, when an unexpected occurrence brought matters to a crisis. On the afternoon of Sunday, the 21st of May, a small detachment of troops, with several officers, who were in observation at a very short distance from the gate of St. Cloud, perceived a man standing close to that gate, vehemently waving a white handkerchief. The signal was regarded with suspicion. After a time the handkerchief disappeared, but soon the man returned, waving it more energetically than before. Still the Versaillists lay close, thinking it a snare. At last Captain Trève, of the French Navy, who was one of the party at the advanced post, resolved to make a trial. Directing his companions to remain sheltered, he cautiously advanced, availing himself of all possible cover, until within a very

short distance of Bastion 64. "What is it?" he then cried, in a subdued voice. "Do you surrender!" "There is no one here," was the reply; "collect your men, and come in at once." Having convinced himself that that part of the *enceinte* was really undefended, Captain Trève hurried back to his friends, telegraphed through the trenches that troops were to be brought up, got together about 300 men, and took possession unopposed of the gate of St. Cloud and the two adjacent bastions. Meanwhile the troops were mustering in his rear, and soon a division was assembled with General Douay in command. The man who had rendered so signal a service to the cause of order was Ducatel, a subordinate *employé* in the municipal service of Paris, who lived near the Point du Jour, and who, having seen the insurgents dislodged from that part of the fortifications by a heavy artillery fire, had risked his life to enable the Versaillists to enter Paris. The gate of Auteuil having been taken, after a sharp fight, he informed General Douay of the possibility of getting to the Trocadéro, and acted as guide to Colonel Piquemal, who was afterwards killed. Under a heavy fire Ducatel advanced alone to the barricade of the Quai de Grenelle, parleyed with the insurgents, and apparently intimidated them, for they fled, and the barricade was taken. But they dragged him with them in their flight, and were about to shoot him at the Ecole Militaire, when the arrival of the Versaillists saved him.

As soon as General Douay had entered the city he was followed by General L'Admirault leading the left wing of the army, and by General Cissey with the right wing. In the course of Monday, the 22nd, the Versaillists, 80,000 strong, were advancing steadily into the interior. On Tuesday afternoon the Buttes Montmartre and the Northern Railway-Station were in their hands, and Generals Cissey and Vinoy were marching on the Hôtel de Ville and the Tuileries. That night the troops were tired, and rested; and then it was that the insurgents, in their mad despair, seized the occasion to carry out a terrible plan of destruction, which, it would seem, had long haunted the previsions of some of the leaders as a possible termination of their resistance. They set fire to Paris. On Wednesday morning, when the troops of Order were pushing their advance, the Tuileries, the Louvre, the Palais Royal, the Hôtel de Ville, the Rue Royale, the Ministry of Finance, and other public offices, were all sending forth lurid flames to the skies. And still more cruel deeds were being committed. At ten o'clock on Tuesday night Raoul Rigault, with a party of armed men, repaired to the prison of St. Pélagie, and calling out M. Chaudey, a late writer in the *Siècle*, who had been incarcerated by the Commune for his disaffection to their rule, had him shot at once. On the following night the convent of the Dominicans at Arceuil was assaulted by a frenzied troop of Federals, and the wretched monks shot down as they fled into the street. The spirit of massacre was abroad. It next wreaked itself on a company of sufferers whose possible fate had long caused the deepest anxiety to the world outside the walls of

Paris. Bismarck, and even, it is said, Cluseret, had endeavoured to mediate for the safety of the venerable Darboy, Archbishop of Paris. While the Versailles troops pressed through the flaming streets, it was hoped to the last that he and his fellow hostages might have been rescued. But their hour had come. On Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday a court-martial was held on the hostages confined at La Roquette, Ferré presiding. The trial was a mock one—many of the victims were not brought up for examination at all. But the same inexorable fate awaited them. The turn of the Archbishop came first. It is said that some of the assassins before firing on him felt an involuntary awe, fell on their knees, and implored his pardon. With him the President Bonjean and four priests met their doom. The rest of the hostages were shot in batches on the succeeding days. A guard consisting of youths and women, drunken and delirious with the fever of revolution, hovered over these dreadful proceedings, and brought in from the streets continually fresh victims for the firing parties. On priests and gendarmes they particularly delighted to pounce. The murderers played with their captives at times like cats with mice, and raised their hopes of deliverance just to disappoint them again. Ferré having let loose a band of convicted criminals on condition of their slaughtering sixty-six defenceless gendarmes, finally signalized his doings at La Roquette by sending forth others laden with cans of petroleum to spread the conflagration raging in the city.

But while these deeds of horror were in progress the avenging troops were steadily pressing on; and, fighting desperately from barricade to barricade, the insurgents fell back. On Thursday Thiers telegraphed to the prefects of the departments:—"We are masters of Paris, with the exception of a very small portion, which will be occupied this morning. The Tuileries are in ashes; the Louvre is saved. A portion of the Ministry of Finance along the Rue de Rivoli, the Palais d'Orsay, where the Council of State holds its sittings, and the Court of Accounts have been burnt. Such is the condition in which Paris is delivered to us by the wretches who oppressed it. We have already in our hands 12,000 prisoners, and shall certainly have 18,000 to 20,000. The soil of Paris is strewn with corpses of the insurgents. The frightful spectacle will, it is hoped, serve as a lesson to those insensate men who dared to declare themselves partisans of the Commune. Justice will soon be satisfied. The human conscience is indignant at the monstrous acts which France and the world have now witnessed. The army has behaved admirably. We are happy in the midst of our misfortune to be able to announce that, thanks to the wisdom of our generals, it has suffered very small losses." On Friday the special Red Republican quarter, Belleville, was encircled by the forces of L'Admirault and Vinoy. It was defended by seven barricades; but these proved insufficient to resist the assault; Belleville was captured, and with it large numbers of the insurgents. The last struggle was on Saturday and Sunday, in the Cemetery of Père la

Chaise. It was obstinate, savage; on the part of the Communists, hopeless. Women fought as well as men. No quarter was given. Finally, General Vinoy remained master of the field. Meanwhile L'Admirault had seized the Buttes Chaumont and Ménilmontant. With the surrender of a few National Guards at Vincennes on Monday the last show of resistance was at an end.

Then came the terrible reprisals. Every member of the Commune who fell alive into the hands of the Versaillists was shot at once. Some had found death in the hour of struggle. Of these last were Rigault, Dombrowski, Eudes, Valles, Bergeret, Delescluze. The last moments of Delescluze, a man of moderation and virtue, in comparison with many of his fellows—even a believer in God, as some of them with astonishment averred—were striking. When the troops of Versailles were pressing on Tuesday from point to point, and no hope of a successful resistance remained, he put on his hat and coat, took his stick, and walked quietly up to the barricade of the Château d'Eau, where he speedily met the death he had long desired. Dombrowski was carried, desperately wounded, to a bedroom in the Hôtel de Ville, and perished there.

A fierce vengeance overtook the unhappy multitudes. To be found with weapons was at once a death-warrant, to be found without them was no safeguard to those who at the last moment had thrown them away. The victorious soldiers slaughtered their late foes in batches, and exulted fiercely in the act. The Marquis de Gallifet rode through the streets on Sunday, followed by a column of several thousand prisoners, of whom he selected eighty, formerly soldiers of the Line, and had them shot without form of trial, outside the Arc de Triomphe. Women were executed without mercy as well as men, for stories had got about, with how much of exaggeration it is difficult to say, of female incendiaries having been seen to wander about Paris during the last days of the Commune, feeding the conflagration of the streets and public buildings with petroleum. There can be no doubt that the excessive extent and ferocity of the military executions during the first few days after the suppression of the revolt served to lessen the impression of the horrors that had occasioned them, and roused a feeling of disgust in the outside world against the Government at Versailles.

Millière, who had been a deputy to the National Assembly, fell into the hands of his enemies, and was shot in the Place de Panthéon, while with his last breath he cried, "Vive la Commune!" "Vive l'humanité!" Afterwards indeed, some asserted that he lived still, and that another had fallen. Valles was stabbed, and left miserably to perish in the streets. No recognized leader found mercy at the moment, but in the search which was continued after the struggle, several were dragged off to the prisons of Satory and the Orangérie, which were soon full to repletion of the captive Communists. Among those who were carried there to await their trial by court-martial were Rossel, Ferré, Assi, Lullier, Courbet, Urbain, and Paschal Grousset. Félix Pyat, always clever at escaping from the troubles he had been the

most active in bringing about, as his comrades said, and Cluseret, managed to elude search, though every effort was made to discover their hiding-places.

The fires burnt on for some days, but the efforts of the soldiers and a change of the wind finally subdued them. When an estimate could be taken of the damage done, it was found that the greater part of the Tuileries, the Library of the Louvre, and a portion of the Palais Royal, had been consumed; also the Hôtel de Ville, the Ministry of Finance, the Théâtres Lyrique and Du Châtelet, great part of the Rue Royale, and many buildings and portions of streets besides. Notre Dame and the Sainte Chapelle had happily escaped the destruction intended for them. The Luxembourg was partially blown up. When stillness fell upon the awful strife of those few days, the appearance of Paris was ghastly in the extreme. Corpses lay heaped together amid the blackened ruins in every variety of contortion and mutilation. Wherever the contest had been fiercest, as at Belleville for instance, and in the cemetery of Père la Chaise, the air was poisoned with their numbers, and the steps of the passers-by were impeded. It was estimated that 10,000 of the insurgents had been killed during the fighting of that week. The killed and wounded of the Versaillists amounted to 2500.

On the 30th, Marshal M'Mahon proclaimed that the capital was to be divided among four commands, comprising all civil as well as military authority; that of the East, under General Vinoy; of the North-West, under L'Admirault; of the South, under Cissey; and of the Centre, under Douay. Soon afterwards the summary executions ceased, and it was given out that all future trials of Communist prisoners should take place at Versailles, before a regularly constituted tribunal. All the inhabitants of the city were to be disarmed, and the National Guard disbanded.

After this manner ended, in blood and flame, that memorable episode in the political history of the civilized world, the two months' Reign of the Commune at Paris.

CHAPTER III.

FRANCE.—Conclusion of Peace—Political Character of the Assembly—Abrogation of Laws against the Bourbon Houses—Manifesto of the Comte de Chambord—French Finance—Supplementary Elections to the Assembly—Debate on Bishops' Petition—Resignation of M. Jules Favre—Paris Municipal Elections—Decentralization Bill—Indemnity to Invaded Provinces—Army Reconstruction Bill—Position of M. Thiers—Proposition Rivet-Vitet—Thiers President of the Republic—Evacuation of Conquered Provinces—Convention for Alsace-Lorraine—Adjournment of the Assembly—Communist Trials—Execution of Rossel, Ferré, and Bourgeois—Conseils-Généraux—Commercial Treaty with England reconsidered—Re-opening of the Assembly—President's Message—Bismarck's Remonstrance—Orleanist Princes take their Seats—"Incident Ordinaire"—"Incident Ranc"—Financial Statement—Thiers' speech on the Income Tax.

THE National Assembly and its chosen chief of the Executive, M. Louis Adolphe Thiers, were thus left the only constituted power in France. Strictly speaking their authority should have expired with the ratification of that Peace upon which they were expressly called together to pronounce; but it was impossible for them to dissolve while the Commune was waging war against them, and it was equally impossible to appeal to the confused voice of the country now when the one pressing need was to restore order and give the country time to think over the situation. Therefore the so-called *Pacte de Bordeaux*, the tacit understanding on which the Assembly had been authorized to act, was conveniently forgotten, and Thiers and the deputies continued to transact business on the basis of a moderate Parliamentary Republic.

It was at the sitting of the 13th of May, a week before the entry of the Versaillist troops into Paris, that M. Jules Favre had laid before the Assembly the definitive Treaty of Peace, which he and the Finance Minister, M. Poyer-Quertier, had just signed at Frankfurt, in conjunction with Prince Bismarck. He admitted, with sorrow, that the efforts which had been made to obtain a modification of the terms, had failed; that the forts on the north and east of Paris, and the neighbouring departments, were to be occupied by the invaders till such time as the German government should deem order to be sufficiently restored in France to guarantee the fulfilment of the engagements contracted; that the indemnity, five milliards of francs, was to be paid as thus: the first half-milliard within a month after the re-establishment of order in Paris; a milliard during the course of the year; another half-milliard on May 1, 1872; the remainder of the indemnity on March 2, 1874. A deduction, however, was to be made of 325 millions of francs in consideration of the railway lines in Alsace and Lorraine, to be taken over by the Germans. The only territorial change from the preliminaries regarded

a strip of land round Belfort, which the French negotiators had demanded for strategic reasons, and which Bismarck had consented to grant, but not without an indemnification on the Luxemburg frontier. On the 18th, after a somewhat needless debate, the ratification of the treaty was duly voted.

There was no doubt that in the Assembly now sitting at Versailles the reactionary element greatly preponderated. A large majority of the so-called *Ruraux* were desirous that a throne of some kind should eventually be established. Some were for reviving the claims of the elder branch of the Bourbons, represented by the Comte de Chambord; some were for a constitutional monarchy under the House of Orleans; some few, even now, would have been content to see the lately-deposed Emperor resume the reins of power. The *bond-fide* Republican party was indeed represented in the various modifications of the "Left" notably by the deputies of the large cities; but the late events at Paris had increased the antagonism of the Assembly, as a whole, to the political views held by Gambetta and the men of September. Now Thiers was known, by his antecedents, to be doctrinally favourable to a limited monarchy on the plan of that of England, and personally attached to the family of his old master, Louis Philippe. But he had accepted office as leader of a Republic, the only form of government possible at the moment of his elevation, and had promised to maintain it as long as he should remain at the head of affairs. He saw in moderate Republicanism the only means of balancing the numerous parties into which the nation as a whole was divided, and the fittest "platform" on which it might be enabled to recruit its shattered resources and make up its mind for the future. On one thing before all others he was intent, to clear the country of the German Army of occupation with the least possible delay. To bring forward the Orleans claims now he was convinced would be premature, and would only make the caldron of public confusion boil up with renewed heat. Therefore when the Duc d'Aumale and the Prince de Joinville had gained their elections to the Assembly in February, he had persuaded them to absent themselves from Bordeaux, and not to press for the reversal of the disqualifying laws against their family. But now that the Paris insurrection was suppressed, some ardent Orleanists thought that the time for a move had come; and on the 2nd of June, M. Brunet suddenly proposed in the Chamber that the existing laws of proscription and banishment against the House of Bourbon should be repealed. Thiers endeavoured to temporize, and to postpone the discussion of the measure. When, however, the debate took place, on the 8th, he withdrew his opposition. "At first," he said, "I opposed the abolition of the law exiling the Princes of the House of Bourbon from France, because I believed (and I still believe) that such a course would be dangerous, and might bring about disturbances in a country where, though civil war is at an end, popular passions have not disappeared. I have since assented to the ideas put forth by the Committee on an engagement being entered into

by the princes that they will not sit in the National Assembly, and will do nothing to justify the apprehensions which their presence in France is capable of exciting." He proceeded to point out that in the interests of order and the public credit it was necessary to postpone the discussion of all irritating questions, and added, "The safety of the Republic has been placed as a sacred deposit in my hands, and I will not betray the trust."

The Bill abrogating the laws of proscription was adopted by 484 votes against 103 : and the elections of the Duc d'Aumale and the Prince de Joinville were subsequently declared valid by 448 votes against 113. Having obtained this definitive recognition of their *status* as citizens, the Orleans princes, in accordance with their promise to Thiers, with whom they had a personal interview, retired for the present from the scene of action. The repeal of the law of proscription applied also to the heir of the elder branch of the Bourbons, living in exile at Fröhsdorf, the Comte de Chambord, the "Henri Cinq" of the Legitimists. The partisans of this prince, so long out of date as an appreciable political element in the country, now began, some to revive the old dreams of divine right, some to speculate on a "fusion" between the two cognate families, in virtue of which Henri V. was to have the first option of reigning as a constitutionally-limited monarch, and if he objected to the terms, then to let the crown devolve on his cousin the Comte de Paris. But while these ideas were in contemplation, the hopes of the Legitimists were shaken by a sudden proclamation issued on the 5th of July from the Castle of Chambord by the royal claimant himself, who had hastened to revisit the banks of the Loire after his forty years of expatriation. "Frenchmen!" he said, "I am in the midst of you." Then, after explaining that he had come for a moment only, and would not remain in France at present to cause embarrassing complications, he averred that he was ready, if called to the throne, to govern "on the broad basis of administrative decentralization" and of local franchises, and to "resume the national movement of the latter end of the 18th century, restoring to it its true character. But," he continued, "people had sought to impose on him conditions to which he could not submit. If France called him, he would come to her with his 'devotion,' his 'principles,' and his 'flag,' that White Flag which had been the standard of Henry IV., of Francis I., and of Joan of Arc," and which he had received as a sacred deposit from the old king his grandfather, who had died in exile. So uncompromising a manifesto seemed to the strongest Legitimists premature, while to the Fusionists it was a dire discouragement. By all the rules of direct inheritance the next claimant to the throne after Henri V. was the Duke of Madrid, son of Don Carlos of Spain; and the white flag, in the hands of its present holder, seemed unlikely to admit of any pact of expediency with the tricolor.

Meanwhile in the Assembly, the financial condition of the country had come on for discussion. On June 12 M. Pouyer-Quertier pro-

posed in the Committee of the Budget the imposition of new taxes to the amount of 460 millions of francs, or 18,500,000*l.* sterling, to be raised, 60 million by stamp-duties, 90 millions on intoxicating liquors, 50 millions on sugar and coffee, 200 millions by raising a duty on the raw material of textile fabrics, and 50 millions on various other imports. It was a declaration of Protectionist principles in the matter of taxation, of which M. Thiers and his finance Ministers were well known to be advocates; and it foreshadowed a reversal of the free-trade policy which under Napoleon III. had led to the commercial treaty with England, and which in the present Assembly was powerfully represented. Pending the consideration of this measure in the Committee, M. Thiers brought before the House in the following week an elaborate statement as to the resources and liabilities of the public exchequer. He estimated the deficit for the two years, 1870 and 1871, at 1631 millions of francs, of which the bank had advanced 1330 millions on loan; and would be able to lend 200 millions more. He stated that the floating debt was 650 millions, the sum now available for unforeseen expenses. To meet the Prussian claims of indemnity and other war expenses he proposed a National Loan, at five per cent. interest, to be issued at 82 or 83, and for the other requirements of the country he declared that the taxes just proposed by the Minister of Finance would be sufficient. He observed that one of those taxes indeed had been objected to, that on raw materials; but he assured the Assembly that such an impost did not involve the re-establishment of a prohibitory system in general. To the establishment of an income tax, suggested by some in the Assembly, he was decidedly opposed. On the whole he declared the situation to be not discouraging. His speech was loudly cheered, and after some discussion the whole Bill was adopted. The subscription list for the new loan was issued on the 27th, and its success was rapid and astonishing. In the session of the very next day, M. Pouyer-Quertier was able to announce to the Assembly that 4 milliard 5 hundred million francs had already been collected, of which 2500 million had been subscribed by Paris alone. "This state of things," he added, "will enable us to fulfil our engagements towards Germany and hasten the deliverance of the country. We shall not wait for the dates fixed for paying the instalments of the indemnity."

A pressing question of the moment was that regarding the supplementary elections to the National Assembly. There were 113 vacancies now to be filled up, some outstanding since February, when the popular members had often been elected for several departments at once—Thiers, for instance, had been chosen for twenty-five—some caused by the death or defection of the insurrectionary deputies. It was evident that the complexion of the Assembly might be considerably modified, in one way or another, by the addition of one-seventh, or more, to its numbers. In the general apathy or timidity of the people the political cliques put forth their engines. Eighteen of the chief Paris newspapers calling

themselves the "Union of the Parisian Press," entered into a league for the purpose of carrying certain candidates of their own nomination, pledged to the cause of order. Against this league an opposition was raised, by a combination of six radical journals, under the title of the "Republican Press Union." And the dreaded International Society itself showed that though subdued it was not killed. It held clandestine meetings, and managed to post up various inflammatory notices on the walls of the capital. The elections came off on Sunday, the 2nd of July, and the Government organs triumphantly proclaimed that the result had been to add a large majority to the moderate or Conservative Republican party, acting in harmony with the Chief of the Executive. Other observers, however, even at the moment, judged differently, and prognosticated rather an increase of the antagonism which from one side or the other subsisted between Thiers and the Assembly. The Conservative element was decidedly preponderant in the Paris elections. The Parisian Press Union carried nearly all its candidates. The "Left" had made some gain in the Provinces, and the return of Gambetta—for Paris and for two departments besides—was no insignificant incident in their favour. That on the whole, Radical principles remained at a discount in the Assembly was clear. The question was what party, or section of a party, was really the strongest among the numerous subdivisions, no less than sixteen, as one contemporary observer declared, into which the caprice and self-will of French opinion within the walls of the Chamber at Versailles distributed itself. The want of a substantial understanding between the Assembly and its Executive Chief revealed itself in every event of the session.

On the 18th, the Budget Committee decided to reject the duties on raw material proposed by M. Pouyer-Quertier, as injurious to the industry of the country, and declared its preference for taxing the home consumption of manufactured produce. It also stated that on examination, M. Thiers' estimate of the deficit had proved below the mark; instead of 488 million francs (or 19,200,000*l.* sterling), it had turned out to be 600 million francs (24,000,000*l.* sterling). New methods of meeting this deficiency must be found. M. Pouyer-Quertier acquiesced in the decision of the Committee, and promised to bring forward a reformed financial scheme after the recess.

On the 22nd a question of ecclesiastical politics came on for debate. It turned upon the petition of a certain minority of the French Bishops, praying for interference on behalf of the Pope's temporal power. The principal speakers were Bishop Dupanloup and Thiers. Dupanloup urged interference, though deprecating war. "Without taking up arms," he said, "France might yet do something for the Pope, and it would be glorious for her to take the initiative of an European intervention." He could "not believe it to be in the designs of Providence that after a reign of eighteen centuries, the Popes were to be salaried chaplains of the wretched

King Victor Emmanuel." Thiers took occasion to deplore the doctrine of nationalities, and the Imperial policy which had allowed, first Italian unity, and then German unity, to become accomplished facts, upsetting the traditional "balance of power" inaugurated by Henri Quatre. He refused, however, to commit himself to any rash engagements. France would be always open to the Pope as a land of refuge; but he had no advice to tender to his Holiness. The appearance of Gambetta in the tribune on this occasion for the first time since his election caused great excitement. He supported Thiers, but the Right made a powerful rally, and amidst great noise and vehemence a motion was carried by a large majority, for referring the petition to the Minister for Foreign Affairs. It was ostensibly in consequence of this vote, but really for other reasons, partly of a public and partly of a personal nature, that M. Jules Favre resigned the Ministry of Foreign Affairs a few days afterwards. He was succeeded in it by M. Charles Rémusat.

The Paris municipal elections, in accordance with the law of April the 14th, took place on the 23rd and 30th of July. Of the eighty successful candidates, half had been put forward on the lists of the Paris Press Union: nevertheless, it was observed with something of surprise that more than thirty belonged to the advanced Radical ranks; that, in fact, some agitators well known during the supremacy of the Commune had again come to the front. The most noted of these was M. Ranc, who had been a member of that body up to an advanced period. His daring assumption of a place in the new Municipal Council, while his friends were awaiting their trial at Versailles, attracted so much notice in the Assembly that he soon found it prudent to retire for a while. The new municipality, in conjunction with M. Léon Say, Prefect of the Seine, an able economist, applied themselves without delay to the consideration of the Paris finances. It was the first time since 1851 that a regularly elected Municipal Council had met in conclave to direct the internal affairs of the city.

Among the leading questions on which the Executive Government at this time found itself in marked disagreement with the Assembly were the Army Reorganization Bill, the Decentralization Bill, and the Bill for Indemnification of the Invaded Departments. The Decentralization Bill was framed with the object of remodelling throughout France the old Departmental Councils, and empowering them to attend to all matters of local interest as apart from politics—truly a line not always easy to draw—to transfer to them, in fact, the principal functions hitherto monopolized by Government Prefects. The measure found its chief supporters in the reactionary deputies of the Right. The Radicals, however clamorous for the civic independence of communes, objected to giving the right of self-government to departments where territorial wealth and rank were sure to assert their superior influence among the rural population. Thiers himself was fixed in the opinion that vigorous government could only be carried on when all the reins of the

State vehicle were in the hands of the central authority. He had fought against the decentralizing tendencies of the municipal law of the 14th of April. He fought now against the projected law of the "Conseils Généraux." The debates upon its different clauses were sharp and numerous. A speech of M. Louis Blanc on the 31st of July gave a lucid exposition of the views entertained by the Left, of which he was a prominent member. The following day the two leading divisions of the Assembly came to a noisy quarrel, which all the temper and tact of the President, M. Grévy, could hardly abate. The point in dispute was as to the right of each General Council to appoint a Standing Departmental Committee. This, in fact, constituted the chief feature of the new law. Its object was to prevent any evasion by the Executive power of the decrees passed in the Council. The Right succeeded in carrying it against Government by a majority of 218, and Thiers, in a fit of vexation, declared that he would no longer consent to govern on such terms, and would demand a vote of confidence. However, a day or two afterwards he had reconsidered the matter, and accepted the Departmental Standing Committees, only with the proviso that the chairman of each committee should be *ipso facto* its senior member, and not be appointed by election. Some further compromises were made. The Councils-General might be convoked on the request of any two of its members. The Chief of the Executive was to have the right of dissolving a Council after giving his reasons to the Assembly. Finally, the question as to the guardianship of the communes—whether by the State or by the Councils—was to be adjourned till after the settlement of the municipal law. The Bill was then adopted by 519 votes against 129.

With regard to the indemnity to be paid to the invaded departments, the majority of the Assembly desired that the whole of France should bear the weight of the pecuniary losses inflicted by the enemy's occupation. Thiers, on the other hand, held it undesirable to create a precedent for making the entire country liable for any devastations committed on its frontiers, and maintained that relief should be given by way of charity, but not as a legal tax. On this question, too, there was a vehement debate in the Chambers on the 5th of August. Again Thiers lost his temper, and threatened to quit the Tribune. Again a compromise was effected. A sum was to be voted by the Chamber and placed in the hands of delegates, who were to ascertain the cases of greatest distress and relieve them accordingly. Whether this relief was to be considered matter of State obligation or of State benevolence remained an open question.

The Army Reconstruction Bill involved several fundamental questions. First, as to the adjustment of the anomalous relations between the three military forces which had served the Government during the late war; the Army of Sedan, the Army of Metz, and the supplementary army which Gambetta had gathered together, when the two first had been carried into captivity. On this subject,

General Cissey, the War Minister, brought forward a motion in the month of July, proposing to quash the decree passed by the Delegate Government of Tours on the 13th of October, 1870, and to institute a general revision of grades by the Bureaux of the Assembly. The opposition, however, of Gambetta and General Faidherbe, and the military element on their side, proved too strong for Cissey, and his motion was rejected. Next, there was the important question as to the principle on which the new military forces of France should be raised. The majority of the Assembly were in favour of compulsory service after the pattern adopted in Prussia, making it necessary for every able-bodied man to go through the ranks. Thiers was of opinion that this would be ruinous to the productive industry of the country, and desired only to maintain the old system of conscription. With this question was closely connected that of the disbandment of the National Guard. Here the majority of the Chamber were for at once disarming the whole force throughout the country. Thiers held it still to be a useful force; capable of regulation, with a standing army to confront it; and refused to sanction its dispersion except as this might be gradually effected, and in proportion to the increase of the regular forces. The views of the majority on both these questions were adopted as a preamble by the Committee appointed to elaborate the Reorganization scheme; and when they brought up their Report on the 19th of August, the provisions of the proposed Bill, as read by General Chanzy, stipulated compulsory service for all able-bodied men between 20 and 40 years of age, the abolition of the system of substitutes, and of soldiers voting while on service, and the dissolution of the National Guard. The Assembly voted "urgency" for the Bill. The acrimony with which all these questions were debated in the Assembly afforded a spectacle neither dignified nor reassuring. M. Thiers, fixed in his opinions, and impatient of contradiction, lost his temper, and gave way to tears of vexation; threatening, when hard pressed, to resign his functions; in other words, as the French phrase had it, to insist on the "*droit de s'en aller*." This threat invariably told with the Chamber, for antagonistic to him as its general spirit was, and various as were the aims and crotchets of its factions, still the feeling prevailed that there was no one but him, who could from years' experience and prestige fitly hold the helm of state at the present juncture of affairs. Some suggested, indeed, that a possible substitute might have been found in M. Grévy, who as President of the Assembly had acted throughout with remarkable tact and ability. But Grévy was not to be cajoled, nor was a change really desired; and when Thiers, at the close of this or that angry discussion on first principles, consented to some compromise, sufficient to save his honour or his pride, his antagonists were satisfied with reaping as much as they could of the fruits of their struggle. One of the stormiest debates of the whole session took place on the 24th of August, in reference to the proposed disbandment of the National Guard. The Assembly had, by a sudden vote, affirmed the principle

of its immediate dissolution ; and it was expected that the Government meant to acquiesce in its decision. But a speech from General Pelissier dispelled the illusion, and this was presently followed by an harangue from Thiers himself, in which he rated the Assembly in vehement terms, and proceeded to expound the relation in which he conceived himself to stand towards it.

"You are not respecting yourselves," he said, "if you do not respect the man to whom you have given your confidence." Great was the excitement—"agitation prolongée"—in the language of French reporters. When, however, he taunted the Right with having the protection of an army of 120,000 men and still being afraid, the Duc de la Rochefoucauld indignantly protested. Thiers begged to be allowed to proceed, and to explain that the danger was not from the Revolutionists of Lyons and elsewhere, but from the divisions in the Chamber, "not, perhaps, according to your idea, but according to mine," he pronounced in an irritating tone. "The whole object of my life, from day to night," he went on, "is to prevent the rival parties here from precipitating themselves on each other ; the whole cause of a moral disorder without parallel among nations lies in our passions." After comparing his position with that of the President of the United States, he went on to say, "Your will is the sovereign will. If I were a weak man I should flatter you. When I think you are wrong, my duty is to tell you. If you wish to be absolute—if when the Government you have chosen thinks you are wrong, you refuse to listen, it has only one thing to do." The storm which succeeded this remark drowned every thing for some time. He remarked that from the interruptions he met with, it would seem that confidence in him was shaken." (Loud cries from the Left of "No, no," but silence on the Right.) "As for me," he continued, "considering that I have spent my life in the service of my country, I have the right to be rewarded by a little attention, and I may venture to say by a *great deal* of esteem."

The inconvenience of this strained state of things between the chief of the Executive and the Assembly had already given rise to sundry projects of readjustment in their mutual relations. A proposition was started by the Left—which, on account of its mouth-piece, M. Rivet, acquired the name of the "Proposition Rivet"—for conferring on Thiers the title and authority of "President of the Republic" for the term of three years, with power of appointing his own Ministers, but without himself possessing a seat in the Assembly. The Right, however, felt that such a scheme involved the practical recognition of a Republic ; and, in the Committee which was appointed to consider it, their objections prevailed. The result was a modification, which went by the name of the "Proposition Vitet"—M. Vitet being the presenter of the Report. The title of "President of the Republic" was accorded for as long as the present Assembly itself should last ; and the responsibility of the President's Ministers to the Assembly was decreed, with the right of the President himself to appear in the Assembly on occasion, and

after due notice on his part. But the preamble was the important part of the Report. It began, "The National Assembly, considering that it has the right to exercise constituent powers," &c. Now this involved a curious contradiction in the position of parties. The Left, denying the Chamber to be constituent, had endeavoured by the Rivet proposition to force a Republican constitution on the country; the Right asserting the Chamber to be constituent by the Vitet proposition, yet refused to make a constitution for the country, and simply prolonged the *Provisorium*. The preamble was carried after an animated contest, and the only addition to it was made by the insertion of a personal reference and compliment to M. Thiers himself, as the newly-appointed President, at the instance of M. Dufaure.

But a President of the French Republic, governing France outside the walls of Paris, was a state of things both anomalous and undignified. So Thiers felt: and in this respect his feelings coincided with the ardent desires of the Radical party in the Chamber for a replacement of the seat of government within the walls of the capital. The Right, on the other hand, deprecated to the uttermost a step which would have brought their deliberations again under the supervision of the Paris mob and its abettors; and through the medium of M. Ravinel, one of their members, they brought forward a motion for transferring definitively to Versailles the whole of the Government offices. In spite of Thiers's opposition, this motion received the substantial approval of the majority.

Meanwhile, how to provide for current expenses was the great difficulty with M. Pouyer-Quertier, the Finance Minister. The Budget Committee reported on September 8th in favour of two-thirds of his proposed taxes, but postponed the discussion of the impost on raw materials till after the recess. M. Pouyer-Quertier moved that, to pay his way, a tax of ten centimes should be levied on all the proposed direct and indirect taxes; but his motion was rejected.

Finally, the last twenty-four hours of the session were occupied with the arrangement of the business which had lain nearer Thiers's heart than any other—the evacuation of ten of the occupied provinces by the German troops. The terms of peace had stipulated the payment of the indemnity by instalments, due at certain periods, and to be followed by the successive evacuation by the Germans of the occupied departments, until, the whole debt discharged, the Germans should have surrendered all their "material guarantees." The close of the whole operation was not contemplated at a nearer date than March, 1874. But Thiers was convinced that nothing was more essential to France than to get rid of the invader. The cost of maintaining him during his occupation was one thing; the moral evil and degradation of bearing his presence in the country was still more to be deprecated. Accordingly, by dint of vigorous financial expedients, and notably by the successful national loan, he quickly raised money for the

first instalment. Then, to expedite matters, he had recourse to paper instead of bullion, and offered the Germans good bills at short dates as valid payment. Prince Bismarck was not averse from the negotiation; he, too, wished in the interests of Germany to bring the business to a close. Still it was something to yield material guarantees for what were after all only "promises to pay," and the Emperor's Ambassador, Count Arnim, was instructed to stipulate for a concession in return. This concession was to be the grant of free trade, for a definite period, between the conquered provinces of Alsace and Lorraine and their former mother-country, France, the severance from which, on commercial as well as sentimental grounds, they had greatly regretted. Now free trade was a bugbear to Thiers, and at first he hesitated; however, the furtherance of his great object overbore every scruple in his mind, and all would speedily have been arranged, save for a modification voted by the Assembly, which so altered the character of the arrangement that Bismarck withdrew his assent. After a long series of negotiations M. Poyer-Quertier at last, on the 13th of October, signed at Berlin a Convention with the German Chancellor, by which the exceptional advantages for Alsace and Lorraine were to terminate at the end of 1872 instead of six months later, and some faint reciprocity was accorded in favour of French manufactures. The paper-money payments were then to be accepted, and six Departments in the east of France evacuated at once by the German soldiers, but left as neutral territory, not at present to be occupied for military purposes by the French, and in case of default in French payments to be reoccupied by the Germans. France undertook to pay 80,000,000 francs every fortnight until the 650,000,000 should be paid, which would entitle her to the entire resumption of the Departments in question. Thus by the end of October, out of the thirty-six Departments held by the invading forces in the month of February, six only remained actually in their hands—viz. Ardennes, Marne, Haute-Marne, Vosges, Meuse, and Meurthe.

On the 12th of September M. Thiers, in his new character as President of the Republic, sent to the Assembly a "Message," which was read by M. Jules Simon, the Minister of Public Instruction. In it the labours of the Session were recapitulated, and the Assembly was invited to adjourn from the 17th of September to December 4. Thiers had already gone through the formality of reappointing his ministers.

A Permanent Committee, consisting of eleven members of the Right, six of the Left, and eight of the Moderate Left and Centre, was appointed to remain at Versailles and control the Government during the recess.

The trials of the Communist prisoners at Versailles had commenced on the 7th of August, after many delays, owing to the amount of evidence to be collected. There were between 3000 and 4000 at Versailles. The whole number on the hands of Government, including those distributed in the various prisons and

hulks between Brest and La Rochelle, amounted to 33,000; but of these upwards of 10,000 were liberated without trial in the course of a few weeks—a somewhat dangerous element to let loose among the population. To the Third Court-martial, under Colonel Merlin, which held its sessions in the Riding-school at Versailles, was assigned the most interesting and important part of the business, the trial of the captive members of the Commune itself, and of the most conspicuous among their agents and officers.

The first sentences were delivered on the 2nd of September. Lullier, the ex-naval officer who had played the popular hero on the 18th of March, and Ferré, the author of the massacre of the hostages, received sentence of death. Urbain and Trinquet, Assi, Bilioray, Paschal Grousset, Jourde, the Finance Minister of the Commune, Courbet the painter, and five others were sentenced, some to imprisonment, some to transportation. Descamps and Ulysse Parent were acquitted. It could not be said that these sentences were indicative of a blood-thirsty feeling on the part of the judges. In fact the reaction from the ferocity of the first reprisals in May had disposed men's minds to a merciful consideration of the crime for which the defeated Communists had to answer, except where actual assassination could be laid to their charge, or where the technical obligations of military or naval office had been violated. The condemnation to death of three so-called "pétroleuses" by the Fourth Court-martial, though on very slight actual evidence, might be thought also a moderate result, considering the panic of horror which the stories of female incendiarism had created in the last days of the revolt.

On the 9th of September came on the trial of Colonel Rossel, one of the ablest, and in his private character the most virtuous of the young and daring spirits who had thrown in their lot with the Paris Revolution. Without one dissentient voice, he was condemned to death. The crime of having deserted his military duty was in the eyes of his judges of greater weight than the acts of outrage and villainy which had been proved against many of the acquitted prisoners; and as expounders of martial law it was doubtless not for them to consider the political complications which might well have made it doubtful whether an officer who had taken service under the Emperor Napoleon was morally pledged to the Government which had of its own unauthorized will superseded the empire. Rossel had actually borne commission as an officer under the Government of National Defence: and that, it was said, left him no choice between obeying the *Provisoire* of M. Thiers and the Bordeaux Assembly, or the Commune which the inhabitants of Paris had elected to administer its affairs. However, there was an extra tribunal entitled the "Committee of Pardons," which was empowered to reconsider on general principles the sentences awarded by the first tribunal, and to this Committee the many and ardent sympathizers with Rossel confidently looked for his ultimate acquittal.

The arch-agitator, Henri Rochefort, cowed in spirit and broken

in health, was tried on the 21st September, and received sentence of transportation for life to some fortress. The only specially important trial that remained was brought before the Sixth Council of War on November 3. It was that of the assassins of Generals Le Comte and Thomas, and it resulted in the condemnation to death of Verdagner, the Communist officer in command of the company in the Rue des Rosiers on that occasion, and of seven accomplices.

The decision of the Committee of Pardons to commute the capital sentence passed on Lullier and on the three *pétroleuses* created no surprise, and it gave increased hope to those who anticipated a favourable consideration of Rossel's case at their hands. For Ferré, who also pleaded for a reversal, hardly any one could have desired a milder fate than that with which he was threatened. But to the general surprise the Committee proved inexorable, not only with regard to the murderer of the hostages but with regard to Rossel also. The final appeal, which Thiers himself was understood to have supported against the influence of the predominant "Right," was rejected on the 26th of November. To the subsequent earnest intercession of Rossel's parents, and of a deputation of Paris students, who crowded to his carriage-door with a petition for mercy, Thiers only replied by alleging his powerlessness in face of the Committee. On the morning of the 28th this brave and gifted, if ill-judging young officer, was taken to the Artillery Butts, on the plain of Satory, along with the atrocious Ferré and Bourgeois, a convicted serjeant, and there shot, all three meeting their fate with the utmost courage. About the same time Gaston Crémieux, the barrister, who had led the Communist movement at Marseilles, expiated his crime in a similar way on the scene of his exploits.

However justifiable on legal grounds, the execution of Rossel—coming as it did so long after the offence for which it was decreed—unquestionably made a painful impression on the public mind, and enhanced the unpopularity of Thiers, who it was generally believed could effectually have prevented it had he possessed the will or the courage to exert his influence. Meanwhile, the intercession of the Paris students in favour of a condemned Communist gave additional strength to the resolution of the majority of the Assembly not to hazard the transference of the seat of government to the interior of the capital.

The interval that elapsed between the prorogation and reunion of the Assembly was filled by many rumours and anticipations. A Bonapartist reaction; a fusion between the Bourbon houses; a remodelling of the existing government, either by a dissolution of the Assembly, as Gambetta and his party eagerly desired, or by its renewal in thirds at stated periods; these were matters widely and eagerly discussed through the darkening months of autumn. Early in October, M. Lambrecht, the Minister of the Interior, died suddenly. His place was filled by M. Casimir Perier, a son of the old minister of Louis Philippe. The elections for the *Conseils Généraux* came off on the 8th and 15th of the same month. They proved

generally favourable to Liberal-Conservative interests. But for a moment they raised also the hopes of the Bonapartists. Prince Jerome Bonaparte suddenly visited Corsica, and was elected a member of the Council there. His party then endeavoured to raise him to its Presidency. Government, however, was on the alert. Not only was he defeated by two votes in the presidential candidature, but the validity of his election to the Council at all was called in question, and the end of the affair was that the baffled Prince took ship and retired to Italy. For the princes of the House of Orleans, on the other hand, more valid prospects seemed to be opening. The Duc d'Aumale was elected President of the Council-General at Beauvais, and the newspaper organs of his party went so far as to recommend his candidature for the Presidency of the Republic, *vice* Thiers. In the month of November the world heard of a veritable little Court being collected around the sons of Louis Philippe in their ancestral hunting-grounds at Chantilly.

An important matter under consideration during the recess was the revisal of the Commercial Treaty with England. Thiers, who had never been in favour of this Treaty, considered that the approaching expiration of the ten years' term for which it was concluded afforded a good opportunity if not of entirely repealing, at least of modifying it in many respects. Negotiations accordingly were entered into with the British government, which are related in another part of our historical survey. In consequence of the difficulties which arose, it was agreed that the matter should stand over till it could be brought as a whole before the Assembly.

That body met at Versailles on the 4th of December. It is said that the deputies came back with more Conservative tendencies than before, owing to the alarm they had taken during their rural retreat, at the symptoms of increasing Radicalism in the provinces. With them came the two Orleans princes, D'Aumale and Joinville, both elected Deputies, but bound by their promise to Thiers not to take their seats in the Assembly. They now came to be released from that promise. Their plea was, that the engagement they had taken to Thiers to save him from embarrassment when acting as provisional Chief of the Executive, applied to the then political constitution of the Government, but was not binding when the Constitution had undergone a change, and the position of Thiers was changed with it. They presented themselves, unwelcome guests, at the house of the President of the Republic on the 5th. He put them off for three days, and even then gave them an evasive answer.

On the 7th Thiers came to the House and read his own Presidential Message. He declared the balance of good to outweigh that of evil in the present condition of affairs, dwelt on the peaceable foreign relations of France, and spoke of the ease and quiet with which the disbandment of the National Guards had been carried out. He dealt with the subject of Commercial Treaties; apologized for the temporary Free-trade Convention arranged with Alsace-

Lorraine, and, in respect to that with England, stated that the French Government had resolved to denounce the Treaty as it stood, leaving the Protocol open, however, till February, 1873, for possible modifications. He notified that the ordinary and extraordinary budgets would reach a total of 2,742,000,000 fr.; that it was proposed to reduce the floating debt to 628,000,000 fr. by gradual redemption; that in consequence of the monetary crisis the Bank of France should be authorized to issue small notes and to increase the circulation by from 400,000,000 fr. to 600,000,000 fr.; that, with regard to the army, Government proposed compulsory service in time of war, and in time of peace an annual contingent of 90,000 men, to be levied by lot, the whole force to consist of 800,000, of whom 450,000 to constitute the standing army on the peace footing. On some of the most "burning questions" of the moment the Message preserved a disappointing silence. Nothing was said as to the admission or non-admission of the Orleans princes to their seats in the Assembly. Nothing was said as to the question of national education, as to which Gambetta and Dupanloup, the former in a recent speech at St. Quentin, and the latter in an angry retort by letter, were waging war. Nothing was said as to the removal of the Assembly to Paris. Very little was said as to the most exciting question of all—the long-expected settlement of the Constitution. But a significant reference to it was introduced just before the end of the Address. The President told the Assembly that it had the sovereign right to decide on the definitive form of government, and advised it not to take an "*initiative précipitée*." It was evident that he desired still to drift along, to keep himself free to act on all questions as they should arise, and above all to prevent the nation from committing itself to any premature decision as to its destinies. The Message pleased neither the Right nor the Left benches of the Assembly. Their disapprobation was loudly and roughly expressed. The Centre alone seemed passively content. There was a special passage in the Address, which had reference to a very painful subject:—"While awaiting the definitive liberation of the country, we have applied ourselves to separate the population from the German soldiers, who are now quartered in barracks. We ask the people to restrain their resentment, which would not abridge their sufferings, but might compromise the safety of France. The life of a foreigner is as sacred as the life of a countryman." The covert apology was not tendered too soon. The very morning on which Thiers delivered his Message a despatch was sent by Prince Bismarck to Count Arnim, the German Ambassador in Paris, complaining in harsh and bitter terms of the recent acquittal of two Frenchmen who had been guilty of murdering German soldiers at Melun and at Paris. "In future," the Imperial Chancellor declared, "should the French authorities refuse to give up assassins, the Germans would be compelled to seize French hostages, and in extreme cases even have recourse to more stringent measures in order to enforce their demands." What made the offence greater

was that the verdict in both cases had been applauded or abetted by office-bearers, by society, by the populace, and by even the gravest organs of public opinion. Bismarck's despatch only gave rise to a fresh burst of newspaper defence of the acquittals and denunciations of the Germans. It was, in truth, a heavy cloud to gather over the Christmas horizon; and the circumstances, when taken in conjunction with the large increase proposed in the army, and with the addition of more than three millions sterling to the War Budget—notwithstanding the heavily-burdened state of the country, and notwithstanding Thiers' known desire to pay off the Prussians quickly—seemed to betoken a longing for revenge on the part of the French, and on the part of the Germans an unyielding sternness, which would too probably precipitate another outbreak of war at no distant period.

Meanwhile the Orleans princes were determined to bring the question of their seats to an issue. On the 18th the *Journal des Débats* published two letters, addressed by the princes to their constituents, pronouncing it as their own opinion that their promise of abstention was no longer binding, and claiming to have the case settled by a higher tribunal. These letters became the subject of debate in the Chamber on the very day of their publication. M. Brunet interpellated the Government. M. Casimir Perier, in reply, declared that the President had not released the princes from their engagement, simply because he considered that engagement as not taken to himself, but to the Assembly. This surrender of his position both confused and enraged the Left. M. Pascal Duprat blamed the abrogation of the laws which had permitted the princes to return to France. An obligation, he said, had been taken by them, and they were now seeking to throw it off. If not taken to Thiers, it had been taken to the Committee appointed to ratify their elections. Upon this M. Batbie and the Duc de Broglie, two witnesses appealed to, denied that any such engagement had been made to the Committee. Finally the Chamber, by 646 voices against 2, adopted a motion proposed by M. Fresneau, to this effect:—"The National Assembly, considering that it is not responsible for, and has no advice to give with regard to, certain engagements in which it did not participate, passes to the order of the day." The princes, thus finding no answering party to their contract, held themselves fairly released from its consequences, and on the following day proceeded to take their seats in the National Assembly.

A stormy incident took place on the 9th, in reference to recent measures taken with reference to the Communist prisoners by the Committee of Pardons. M. Ordinaire, a violent member of the Left, declared that as a member of the Assembly he declined all responsibility in such measures; and in reply to violent protests from the Right, shouted, "You are stained with blood! The Commission is not a Commission of Pardons, but a Commission of Assassins!" Great was the uproar at such outrageous language, and when the President M. Grévy proposed that formal censure should

be inflicted by the Assembly on its unruly member not more than thirty of the extreme Left opposed the vote.

On the 15th M. Thiers spoke for an hour and a half in favour of the return of the Assembly and the Government to Paris, and was heard with much deference. He laid stress upon three principal considerations: First, that Paris had become the capital of France by the work of time and circumstances, not through the acts of the old monarchies; secondly, that it was a real intellectual and artistic focus, shedding its rays over the provinces; thirdly, that a return to Paris would confer strength upon the Government of France in its relations with Europe, and would deprive the Bonapartists of one means of agitating the country. He asked to be heard again by the Committee when it should have deliberated upon the matter. The prospects of a return to the capital seemed, however, likely to be materially affected by a personal question which occupied the Assembly five days later. M. Raoul Duval, a young member, stepped forward to question the Government as to the immunity enjoyed by M. Ranc, the noted Communist, now quietly occupying a seat in the Municipal Council of Paris, while so many ignorant and misguided adherents of his former party had been brought to justice. He read the various decrees of the Commune to which Ranc had been a party; decrees of confiscation, of dismissal from office, of hostage reprisals. His speech elicited loud applause from the Right. M. Dufaure, on behalf of Government, suggested that the military authorities alone were responsible for the selection of persons to be prosecuted. M. Duval indignantly rejected the evasion, and proposed the following resolution: "Counting on the equal application of the law, the House passes to the order of the day." But the defenders of Government objected; and a discussion ensued, in which damaging admissions on their part were elicited. Their position seemed dangerous, until an ultra-Imperialist, M. Prax Paris, came to their rescue, and succeeded in carrying a prefatory clause to M. Duval's motion, viz., "Having heard the explanation of the Ministers of War and of Justice, and counting on the equal application of the law," &c. A few days afterwards M. Ranc was put in nomination by one of the radical cliques of the city for the office of deputy to the Assembly, vacant since the death, or disappearance—for the Communists maintained that the identity had been mistaken—of M. Millièrre in the month of May. However, his name was presently afterwards withdrawn, and that of Victor Hugo substituted for it.

Towards the close of the month, M. Pouyer-Quertier laid his financial statement before the House. On this subject we give a few extracts from the *Journal des Débats* :—

"The credits asked for the year 1872 amount in round figures to 2415 millions of francs. That amount does not include the cost of departmental services and certain temporary expenses immediately resulting from the war, which are carried to a special account. The credits granted under the Empire for 1871 only amounted to 1852

millions, thus showing an excess of 563 millions in 1872. The figures relating to the public debt and dotations are doubled, having risen from 555 millions to 1109 millions; it is true that in this latter amount is included 200 millions for the sinking fund. The estimated receipts for 1872 are put at 2429 millions, which would leave a surplus of receipts over expenditure of 14 millions. The estimate of receipts for 1871 under the Empire was 1880 millions, which leaves an increase of 548 millions for 1872. It is those 548 millions added to an amount equal to the loss sustained by the transfer of Alsace-Lorraine which must be met by new taxation. Starting from those facts, M. Pouyer-Quertier estimates the additional charge to be met in our future Budgets at 650 millions, but it is important to observe that in that sum of 650 millions are included two sinking funds,—first, the 200 millions which the State is bound to repay each year to the Bank of France; and, secondly, the repayments to the Departments and the Communes, to the extent of thirty-eight millions per annum on account of the expenses incurred for the mobilized National Guards. Of these 650 millions required by the Government, the taxes which have been voted this summer and autumn would of themselves produce more than 366 millions. Some forty millions might be saved under different heads and by an increase of the revenue obtained from forests and domains belonging to the State. There would then remain 247 millions to be provided for by new taxation.”

It was truly a formidable problem how to raise an additional sum of ten millions sterling annually to the public revenue. Various taxes were proposed; and again M. Pouyer-Quertier brought forward his favourite scheme of a heavy impost on raw materials. To an income tax, advocated by a large party in the Assembly, both he and the President of the Republic declared themselves inexorably opposed. It was the subject of a very remarkable speech, by M. Thiers himself, on the 26th. He declared that the scheme of French taxation must be looked upon as a whole, and that it was eminently favourable to the poor. The easy classes paid three-fourths of the whole taxation, and it would be grossly unfair to alter the distribution of the public imposts further to their prejudice, even if the great annoyance occasioned by the inquisitorial nature of the income tax were not taken into consideration. Dismissing the income tax, he maintained that the taxes on raw materials were the best way of getting at the required money. He owned that this was contrary to English notions, as introducing the system of protection in one of its worst forms. He even admitted that Free Trade was the best system for the English: were he an Englishman, he should be a Free-trader himself. But he was prepared to prove that with regard to France it was otherwise.

On the 29th Thiers obtained from the Assembly a vote of augmentation by 400,000,000 francs to the circulation of the Bank of France.

CHAPTER IV.

GERMANY—Royal Proclamation, accepting the Imperial Crown—Public rejoicings—Return of the Conquerors—Elections to First Parliament of the German Empire—Political Parties—International and Ultramontane Extremes—Debate on the Address—Conduct of the Clerical Party—Bill for Incorporating 'Alsace-Lorraine—Bismarck and the Peace of Frankfort—Military Triumph at Berlin—Dr. Dollinger and the "Old Catholic" Movement—Bismarck's Policy against the Ultramontanes—Interview of the Emperors of Germany and Austria at Salzburg—Religious Congresses at Mayence and at Munich—Count Benedetti's "Case"—Reassembling of Parliament in October—Emperor's Speech—Bismarck's Speech on the Convention with France—The Bishops' Address—Bill to prohibit Pulpit Politics—Bills of Centralization, &c.—Budget—Meeting of Diets—Attitude of Extreme Republicanism—Public Prosperity—Cholera—Emperor William

AUSTRO-HUNGARY—Count Beust and the two parties of Centralization and Federalism—Hohenwart Ministry—Meeting of the Reichsrath—Finance—Position of Parties—Count Hohenwart's Scheme of Reform—Dissolution of the Reichsrath—New Elections—"Home Rule" for Bohemia—Opposition to it by Counts Beust and Andrassy—Imperial Rescript—Fall of Hohenwart—Kellersperg Ministry—Resignation of Count Beust—Count Andrassy Minister for Foreign Affairs—Kellersperg retires—Adolf Auersperg succeeds him—Auersperg Programme—Winter Session of the Reichsrath—The Emperor's Speech.

GERMANY.

ONE can hardly experience a greater sense of contrast than in turning one's thoughts from the condition of France in the year 1871—marked by ruin, discord, disintegration—to that of Germany—triumphant, powerful, and occupied in consolidating, by a mighty principle of attraction, the hitherto loosely-compacted elements of the national polity. Our present chapter will fitly begin with the Royal Proclamation which was read out to the Upper and Lower Houses of the Prussian Diet on the 18th of January, announcing the revival of the ancient title of Emperor of Germany in the person of the Prussian monarch, now absent at the siege of Paris :—

"We, William, by God's grace, King of Prussia, hereby announce that the German Princes and Free Towns having addressed to us a unanimous call to renew and undertake with the re-establishment of the German Empire the dignity of Emperor, which now for sixty years has been in abeyance, and the requisite provisions having been inserted in the constitution of the German Confederation, we regard it as a duty we owe to the entire Fatherland to comply with this call of the United German Princes and Free Towns, and to accept the dignity of Emperor.

"Accordingly, we and our successors to the Crown of Prussia henceforth shall use the Imperial title in all our relations and affairs of the German Empire, and we hope to God that it may be vouchsafed to the German nation to lead the Fatherland on to a blessed future under the auspices of its ancient splendour. We undertake

the Imperial dignity, conscious of the duty to protect with German loyalty the rights of the Empire and its members, to preserve peace, to maintain the independence of Germany, and to strengthen the power of the people. We accept it in the hope that it will be granted to the German people to enjoy in lasting peace the reward of its arduous and heroic struggles within boundaries which will give to the Fatherland that security against renewed French attacks which it has lacked for centuries.

“May God grant to us and our successors to the Imperial Crown, that we may be the defenders of the German Empire at all times, not in martial conquests, but in works of peace in the sphere of national prosperity, freedom, and civilization.”

The Prussian Diet closed its sittings on the 17th of February, having sanctioned provisionally, for the as yet unassembled German Parliament, a financial credit of fifty million thalers for carrying on the war.

On the 27th of February, and again on March the 3rd, there were great public rejoicings on account of the acceptance of the Peace preliminaries. Berlin was truly at this time the City of Triumphs. If the news of victories had hitherto gladdened the hearts of its inhabitants, the news of the cessation of war was still more welcome to them. The hard necessities of the distant campaign, which, under the law of German military service told on all classes of the population, dragging peace-loving citizens from their homes, and interrupting the ordinary pursuits of life, were keenly felt by burgher, peasant, and upper-class families alike. The earnestness of domestic affection in German hearts was even outbalanced by their patriotic devotion; but the two sentiments acted on each other, and the result was a gravity and moderation of demeanour in the hour of national jubilee which drew the notice of all beholders. “A more quiet and composed crowd,” says one English visitor on the 3rd of March, “it would be difficult to imagine. No cheering, no jokes. Like regiments marching along in regular array, people moved from street to street, steadily, industriously, but without any outward sign of emotion. Only when the Crown Princess and the other Princesses drove along to inspect the charming sight enthusiasm was kindled, and vented itself in deep and continuous cheers.” All the churches were crowded with worshippers returning thanks.

Within a few more days the conquerors were at home again. Count Bismarck arrived at Berlin on the 10th. The Emperor, Crown Prince, Prince Frederick Charles, and Count Moltke, with the whole of the head-quarters’ staff, entered the city on the 16th, and proceeded from the railway-station to the palace amid enthusiastic acclamation.

The 22nd was the Emperor’s birthday, when he attained the age of seventy-four years. Numerous German Princes seized the occasion to offer their congratulations in person. The municipalities of Berlin, Breslau, and Charlottenberg presented addresses.

“More than four centuries and a half have elapsed,” said the Burgomaster of Berlin, “since Divine Providence sent the Hohen-

zollern to take care of our Marches, then a prey to every kind of disorder. In this long time the princes of your royal house have worked and toiled for us in a spirit of paternal solicitude, and without even resting from the task they had undertaken. By their own example they have taught the people that to fulfil one's duty is the sheet-anchor of life. They have called themselves, and have in reality been, the first servants of the State. For our successes we are not indebted to mere good fortune, but to long and laborious exertions. . . . The work has been accomplished at last, and the glorious sceptre of the Hohenstauffens is transferred to the hand of the Hohenzollerns. We pray God to permit your Imperial and Royal Majesty long to enjoy the fruits of your exertions amid the love and reverence of the German people and the admiration of the world. May the German people be benefited for many years by the wisdom, firmness, and strength of him who has re-established the Empire! May the Emperor, who has extended our frontiers and added fresh laurels to our banners, be destined alike to promote the blessings of peace, and to increase and develope our welfare, liberty, and culture! May God grant this!"

The representatives of Austria, Spain, and Italy hastened to address their felicitations. In the fulness of his own dignities the new representative of Charlemagne showed himself not unmindful of the Paladins who had stood by his side in the hour of victory; by whom the basis of each victory was laid. Bismarck was raised from the rank of Count to that of Prince; Count Moltke was made a Field Marshal; to Von Roon the title of Count was accorded. Large dotations in land and in money were subsequently accorded to the heroes of the war, and fresh honours and titles added to those which the princes of the imperial house already bore.

On the 3rd of March the elections for the first *Reichstag*, or Parliament, of United Germany, were held by universal suffrage throughout the precincts of the new empire. When the results became known, it appeared, to the surprise of many political prophets, that the southern portion of the empire, instead of exhibiting the "particularist" tendencies for which, before the war with France, Würtemberg, and still more Bavaria, had been the favourite soil, returned for two-thirds of their deputies men of decided "Unitarian" opinions; while the remaining third, Ultramontanes and Democrats alike, seemed disposed to acquiesce in the unity programme, and utilize it as they best might towards the furtherance of their respective views. In Baden and Hesse "Unitarians" were almost exclusively returned. On the other hand, the northern elections showed a gain of twenty seats to the Ultramontanes in the Catholic districts of Prussia, while the pronounced Secessionists, Ultra-Liberals and others, secured, in Prussia likewise, an increase of about a dozen seats. On the whole there was a noticeable re-partitioning and re-adjustment of political forces in the new Parliament. One of the most significant facts was the entire dissolution of the old particularist anti-national faction which formerly took its stand on the

separate autonomy of the German States. Accomplished facts had at last driven this party from its battle-ground; and, while some joined the "Party of Progress," and others approached the more moderate Liberal ranks, a few of its members cast in their lot with the Ultramontane clericals. Of these was Dr. Windthorst, formerly Hanoverian minister, a Parliamentary strategist and debater of no mean ability. On the other hand the "Clericals," who, though prone to act in the Prussian diet, had been scarcely known as a party in the North German Assembly, stepped forward a strong and serried phalanx on the Opposition platform. The unconditional supremacy of Rome was their watchword—a watchword to which the recent definition and promulgation of the Infallibility dogma had given a far more weighty meaning than it had borne of yore. Occupying the centre of the Assembly, the sixty resolute Members of whom this section consisted became known as the Party of the Centre (*Centrumsfraction*). The so-called Liberal-Imperial Party (*Liberale Reichspartei*) also took its beginning from this session. It was jeered at by its satirists as a party of expedients and compromises, and nicknamed the "mixed pickles." Some of the *quondam* Particularists had joined this party; so had some of the old Liberals. It was a body of somewhat uncertain principles, but on the whole useful to Government in the work of the day. The other political divisions of the Chamber retained their old appellations, though in their actions and alliances they were necessarily influenced by the altered bearings of many public questions. The "Conservatives" mustered about fifty heads; their leader was Herr von Blanckenburg. The "Free-Conservatives," newly called the German Imperial Party (*Deutsche Reichspartei*), numbered thirty-eight: the Hanoverian Count Münster was one of its most prominent members. The collective "Left" consisted of the "National Liberals" and of the "Party of Progress;" and, if the Liberal-Imperial Party were reckoned as belonging to their side of the Chamber, might count upon not less than half the voices in the Chamber. The thirteen Polish Members occupied the farthest corner of the Left benches; and with the three "social democratic" Members, Sonnemann, Schraps, and Bebel, and about thirty unattached deputies, nicknamed the "wild men," bring to a close the enumeration of the various partisan regiments that met to fight the Parliamentary campaign of the first Imperial *Reichstag*.

What we shall have to remark in the constitutional history of the chief continental monarchies this year, and in none so conspicuously as in that of Germany, is the inter- and counter-action of three political factors: Revolutionism, as represented by the Socialists in general, and ultimately by the redoubtable "International Association for the Rights of Working Men;" Clerical reactionism, as represented by the Ultramontane or Infallibilist school, and, with some modifications, by all who, in the dread of infidelity and democracy, welcomed any arbitrary *dictum* which claimed to limit the exercise of the human intellect; lastly, the Liberal

State Governments, whose aim was to steer forward steadily between both extremes, and who were hated accordingly by both—hated so much, and feared so much, as carrying with them the weight of material strength and sound public opinion, that Socialists and Reactionists were fain at times to approach each other in order the more effectually to hamper the arm of authority. Thus Romish Infallibilists were heard to express their preference for Garibaldi and his doctrines over Victor Emanuel and the politics of a United Italian Kingdom; and German High Church priests were known on occasion to connive at Socialist intrigues, so that only the odious Protestant Government of William the First and of Bismarck might be brought into difficulties thereby. In fact, the friendly proclivities of the “Red” and the “Black” Jesuits became a common topic of remark in more than one European country. For the German Chancellor, the war he had to wage this year with the Ultramontanans in order to defend against their determined and bitter attacks the great fabric of United Empire which it had cost him so much pains to weld together, was scarcely less arduous than that on which he had just turned his back on the bloody plains of France.

The first battle was fought on the subject of the Address, voted by the House in answer to the Speech with which the Emperor opened Parliament on the 21st of March. The Speech, after alluding in lofty terms to the accomplished work of German unity, went on to say, “In former times, Germany, misled by the policy which its rulers adopted from foreign traditions, imbibed the seeds of decay through interference in the life of other nations. The new Empire takes its birth from the self-subsisting spirit of the people itself, which, never taking up arms except for defence, is steadfastly devoted to the works of peace. In its intercourse with foreign nations, Germany demands for her citizens no greater consideration than what justice and civilization involve, and, uninfluenced by liking or disliking, leaves it to every nation to find its own way to unity, to every State to determine for itself the form of its constitution. We trust that the days of interference in the life of other nations will never, under any pretext or in any form, return.” In this announcement the Clericals rightly saw the annihilation of all their hopes for German interference in behalf of the Pope’s temporal sovereignty. Accordingly, when the Address, simply echoing each clause of the Imperial Speech according to custom, was proposed, they brought forward, as an amendment, the omission of the words in which the declaration of non-interference had received favourable comment. Herr Reichensperger, one of their ablest leaders, frankly avowed that, in the opinion of his party, the German Emperor should make the Pope’s interests his own, and should attack Italy, in case no amicable arrangement could be effected to restore the temporal power. Ketteler, Bishop of Mayence, then criticized the passage in the Address which traced the decline and fall of the old German Empire to its intimate connexion with the Papacy. To protect the invaluable treasures

of religion and morality, he said, had ever been the pride of the German race ; to abandon this course from pedantic adherence to the non-intervention principle was to adopt a policy of questionable merit. From a military point of view the new Empire was certainly strong enough ; but it remained to be seen whether it would be likewise based upon justice, virtue, and the fear of God. The Liberals replied by expressing their astonishment that the Ultramontanes should think the present a favourable period for reviving a doctrine considered antiquated centuries ago, and that a small but active party among the Catholics should advertise and enforce a teaching which many ardent Romanists had been afraid to avow for many years past. Religion was one thing, and the political position of the Pope another. Catholicism was one thing, and an Infallible Pontiff who arrogated to himself the right of dictating to nations and sovereigns another. Henceforth, they declared, the German Emperors would have a German policy, not an Italian policy, as their predecessors had in the olden times. The original address was voted by 243 deputies against 63. Many eminent Bavarian Catholics spoke on the Government side. The Ultramontanes found ill-matched allies in the Social-democratic party, and in the Hanoverian and Schleswig malcontents. The Poles abstained from voting on this occasion.

The defeated clerical party were not long in finding another battle-field. The order of the day was the revision of the new Imperial Constitution. It was generally understood in the House that a vote of acquiescence should be given. Even the Progress party considered that the moment would be ill-chosen for a contest on first principles. The Polish members, however, threw down the gauntlet first by proposing that their provinces should be excluded from the Federal territory, and only united to the Crown by a personal tie. They received a sharp and characteristic answer from Bismarck. "Gentlemen," he said, "you are no nation, you represent no nation, you have no nation to back you up ; you are backed up only by your own fictions and illusions ; and it is one of those illusions to suppose that you are elected to represent a Polish nationality. You are elected to represent the interests of the Catholic Church, and for that exclusively." Then the Catholic party brought forward their amendment, which required liberty of the press, liberty of speech, liberty of assemblies and of associations, liberty of religion, and the claim of every Church to settle its own denominational matters as "fundamental rights," to be inserted in the new Constitution : an enlightened and advanced programme, which, coming from the partisans of the Infallible Church, reminds one of the "toleration" measures so speciously put forward by the bigot James II. of England. The principal speakers on the clerical side were the younger Reichensperger, who proposed the amendment, Bishop Ketteler, and Dr. Windthorst. Heinrich von Treischke, speaking on the other side, asked why they had omitted from their programme the well-known article of the Frankfort fundamental law, "Science and the teaching of Science are free," or the Prussian constitutional

article sanctioning civil marriages. Their proposed six articles, he declared, were but a delusive compromise. It was giving the nation stones instead of bread. Bishop Ketteler spoke with eloquent address, taking his stand on the principle of abstract justice, and claiming the right of each Church to autonomy as a "Magna Charta of religious peace in Germany." In spite of all the dexterity and acuteness of their advocates, however, the clerical propositions were ill received. On every side they were assaulted. Blanckenburg, the Conservative leader, from whom they had hoped better things, rejected their advances. Deputies from the North and South alike stepped forth to oppose them. Finally, when the vote was taken, 223 voices were on one side, 59 on the other.

Then fresh occasion of contest arose on the subject of election verifications. The Romanist clergy were accused of having interfered and intrigued in the elections; of having denounced from their pulpits the choice of Protestants or Moderates as a sin against the Church, and in other ways made use of their power over consciences. Some zealous members proposed to nullify all elections where such practices could be proved. But in this matter the Conservatives of the "Right" refused to act against the Centre; and in the National and Liberal parties a feeling arose that the knife might cut both ways, and that to enforce inquiry with uncompromising rigour, might have some awkward consequences for themselves. Accordingly the matter was allowed to subside into a reference to the Chancellor of each individual case where unfair manœuvres, either on the part of the clergy or of Government officials, could be proved; with the award of punishment in fitting instances. Bismarck, through the German Ambassador at Rome, however, took care to bring the refractory conduct of the German priests under the notice of the Papal Court; and was able to announce, a few weeks later, that Cardinal Antonelli had intimated the disapproval entertained of it in the highest quarters.

The Bill for the incorporation of Alsace and Lorraine came on after Easter, and was read three times. Some alterations were introduced by the Committee, and, as finally adopted, it provided that the sole and supreme control of the two provinces should be vested in the Emperor of Germany and the Federal Council till January 1, 1873, when the Constitution of the German Empire was to be introduced. Two deputies, Sonnemann and Schrapps, voted against annexation.

On this subject Prince Bismarck spoke on the 3rd of May, and again on the 26th. On the first occasion he made some important revelations. "Ten months ago," he said, "no one in Germany desired war, but all were determined, if it should be forced upon us, to carry it through, and to obtain guarantees against a recurrence of attacks by France. France, possessing Alsace, continually threatened Germany. On the 6th of August, 1866, the French Ambassador handed me an ultimatum demanding the cession of Mayence to France, and telling us, in the alternative, to expect an immediate declaration of war. It was only the illness of the Em-

peror Napoleon which then prevented its outbreak. During the late war neutral Powers made mediatory proposals. In the first instance we were asked to content ourselves with the costs of the war and the razing of a fortress. This did not satisfy us. It was necessary that the bulwark from which France could sally forth for attack should be pushed farther back. Another proposal was to neutralize Alsace and Lorraine. But that neutral State would have possessed neither the power nor the will to preserve its neutrality in case of war. We were obliged to incorporate Alsace with the territory of Germany in order to ensure the peace of Europe. It is true the aversion of the population of Alsace and Lorraine is an obstacle to such a measure. Still, the population is thoroughly German, forming a sort of aristocracy in France by virtue of its noble and Teutonic qualities. We shall strive to win back to us this population by means of Teutonic patience and love. We shall especially grant communal liberties. The Federal Council will carefully examine all amendments proposed by the Reichstag. Let us work together with mutual confidence."

On the third reading of the Bill he said that the first thing it was important to do was to give the Alsatians the rights of German citizenship, and introduce freedom of traffic with Germany. It was better that Alsace should hold the position of a province of the Empire than be annexed to Prussia, because the inhabitants were animated with greater sympathy for Germany than for Prussia. He laid stress upon the necessity of ascertaining the opinions of the Alsatians respecting the new institutions to be established. The Councils-General would be elected, so that these Departmental Assemblies might be at hand to give the Government information respecting the wants of the country. He added that the task which he had set himself on assuming the portfolio of Minister for Foreign Affairs—namely, the establishment of a German Empire—had been accomplished in less time than he had expected. He now regarded his political obligations to the Fatherland as to a certain extent fulfilled, and if with his weakened health and diminished capacity for work he did not dread to undertake his present labours, the reason was to be found in the fact that he was prompted by a certain feeling of responsibility for the fate of these two provinces. Alsace and Lorraine were now, by virtue of the Treaty of Peace, free from debt. He had sought by his pecuniary arrangements with France to improve their position. The next task to be achieved would be to create a trustworthy body of officials from among the native population.

Bismarck was well aware of the difficulties which the strong French sentiment of the conquered provinces threw in the way of their amalgamation with the German Empire. His great object was to regulate and temper the process, to prevent the too hasty enforcement of German laws and institutions. For this he strained to the utmost his great personal influence and authority. He had now succeeded in obtaining liberty to manage Alsace and Lorraine

exactly as he chose until the beginning of 1873. He believed in the gradual operation of two influences—the material well-being of the present generation, and the educational training of the next. Accordingly his first measure was to accept the payment of a portion of the first instalment of the French indemnity in notes of the Bank of France, in order that he might have immediate funds for the wants of the people, to whom the use of those notes was familiar. At the same time an edict was issued enforcing compulsory education, after the German pattern, on every child above the age of six years.

The great Chancellor was the moving spring both of legislation and diplomatic action in the new Empire at this time; and to his incisive energy it was owing that the Peace negotiations, which had been lingering on ever since March at Brussels, were brought to a sudden conclusion at Frankfort on the 10th of May. The French Government had interposed many obstacles in the settlement of terms, especially as to the mode in which their payments were to be made, and the liabilities of Alsace and Lorraine with regard to the French National Debt. To arrange these and other points of the Treaty, in a personal interview with Bismarck, Jules Favre came to Frankfort. The Chancellor seized his opportunity, and did not let the matter drop till he had secured the French Minister's signature to the Treaty of Peace as a whole, leaving minor details of finance to be arranged by a separate convention. Two days afterwards he laid before the Parliament at Berlin an account of his achievement, in one of those remarkable speeches, frank, clear, and devoid of all circumlocution, which seem the very reflex of his own commanding character.

"When going to Frankfort," he said, "the utmost I hoped was to obtain a fresh guarantee for the indemnity, and perhaps some concession in the way of a more speedy payment. But when in my interviews with the French Ministers, I discerned the possibility of coming to a final arrangement at once, and settling matters at Frankfort, without re-opening the Conference at Brussels, I hastened to avail myself of this opportunity, and effected an adjustment which will lighten the military burdens of Germany and France, and besides contribute to the restoration of order in the latter country. The French people wanting peace, the present Government, by conferring the desired boon, will, we hope, satisfy the popular yearnings. Any other Government, were it to supersede M. Thiers by force, would not be thought as fully identified with the restoration of peace as was his. Still, although meeting the French negotiators with the most pacific intentions, I was not sanguine enough to hope for a speedy termination of the whole affair. In a business of this sort there are so many details to be arranged that, unless both parties are animated by a most conciliatory spirit, weeks, and even months are required to get through the work. We have, however, succeeded in settling the principal points at issue, and all that remains to be done is to wind up by applying to

some subordinate items the principles we have laid down. The negotiations for this purpose will be held at Frankfort." He discussed fully the monetary and territorial arrangements, which have already been noticed in our French history of this year; and, after announcing that the final ratifications were to be exchanged on the 20th of the present month, concluded thus:—"I believe we have obtained from France all that we could reasonably expect. We have rendered our frontier safe, and we have insured the payment of the war indemnity as far as is humanly possible. More extensive demands would have entailed great sacrifices. I have every confidence that the French Government intends to carry out the provisions of the Treaty, and that it will have the power so to do. The belief that it will not be possible to raise the large amount of the war indemnity is not shared by the French Minister of Finance. I entertain the hope that the peace which has been concluded will prove lasting and full of benefit, and that we shall not for a long time have to make use of the guarantees we have retained to secure ourselves against renewed aggression."

On the 15th of June the Parliamentary session was closed by a speech from the throne, and on the following day was solemnized a grand military triumph in honour of the war. A blue cloudless sky and a brilliant sun were its accompaniments. The Emperor rode in through the Brandenburg gate, preceded by the illustrious trio, Bismarck, Von Roon, and Moltke, while before him and around him rode many warriors whose names had been famous in the late war. The Crown Prince and Prince Frederick Charles came next after the Emperor, and were followed by an illustrious retinue—thirty German sovereigns and princes of reigning families, arrived expressly to swell the triumph of the newly-elected head of the German Empire. The Emperor, having received an address from the Burgomaster, proceeded to inaugurate the equestrian war-statue of his father, King Frederick William III., in a square at right angles with the Opera-Platz. At night the whole town was an illuminated fairyland. On Sunday, the 18th, a solemn thanksgiving service took place in all the churches.

We must now advert to the movement within the Roman Catholic Church itself, which brought a new element into the antagonism between the Government and the Papal party, and in the eyes of some persons foreshadowed a Reformation analogous to that of Luther, but more favourable to the hopes of an eventual reunion of Christendom, inasmuch as it held to the primary Catholic principles which Luther had foresworn. Those who even now indulge such anticipations do not perhaps appreciate the differing circumstances which would seem to deprive the new Reformation movement of the vital inspiration of the older one. It began as a movement of scholars merely, whose protest against Rome rested on historical grounds: it was not an annulment of human authority over conscience; it was only a shifting of it from Popes to Councils. It was neither a popular claim for the independent position of the soul

as towards God, nor an emphatic exposure of lies palpable to common investigation. Moreover, it was an emphatically negative movement. It did not appeal to any fact or doctrine as an energizing principle of life and growth. The opinions of the *Alt Katholiken*, as these thinkers liked to style themselves, in order to indicate the novelty of the Infallibility "development," had been defining and consolidating themselves since the breaking-up of the Vatican Council in the autumn of 1870. The excommunication of Dr. Döllinger by the Archbishop of Munich on April 19, on account of his refusal to retract his opposition to the dogma, gave a "new departure" to their cause. A war of addresses and counter-addresses was the immediate result of the excommunication sentence. Most of Döllinger's colleagues in his own divinity school, not a few canons of his cathedral, a vast number of the Bavarian lower clergy, and nearly all the laity, testified their agreement with him. The young and romantic King of Bavaria lent the support of his personal sympathies to the Döllinger movement. While his Ultramontane Minister, Count Bray, indeed, remained at the helm of affairs, the necessity of maintaining Bavaria as a representative Catholic Power, and of counteracting the now pronounced anti-Papal politics of Bismarck, was urged upon King Louis with some effect; but Count Bray resigned at the end of July, and a Cabinet of another complexion than his came into power, and on the 27th of August Herr von Lutz, the Bavarian Minister of Worship, addressed a letter to the Archbishop of Munich, which was nothing less than a declaration of war against the politics of the high clerical party. He challenged the proceedings against Döllinger; he declared the Infallibility dogma to be an innovation pernicious to the interests of the State; he asserted the right of the *Placitum Regium*, by acting without which the bishops who published the decrees of the Vatican Council had been guilty of a breach of the Constitution. Von Lutz had recently had an interview with Count Bismarck, and it was evident that an understanding subsisted between the two statesmen. Bismarck had a month previously taken a very decided move on the chess-board of ecclesiastical politics—a move which was, in fact, the immediate cause of Count Bray's resignation. By the arbitrary but legal fiat of a Royal Order he had decreed the abolition of the Denominational Boards hitherto subsisting in the official Department of Public Worship and Education within the Prussian dominions. It had been the rule hitherto to appoint Protestant and Catholic Councillors to represent within that department the religious interests of their respective sects; and the consequence had been an immense increase of the Ultramontane influence. Under the superintendence of the late President Von Mühler the department had come to be reputed as little less than a nursery for concealed Jesuitism. Not from any philosophical tendencies in behalf of secularism, therefore, but from the sense of present dangers arising from the action of the Romish clerical party, Prince Bismarck now announced that the settlement of points directly affect-

ing the legal constitution of the Church having been completed, any future questions must be within the province of merely legal issues, and Denominational Boards should cease, together with their *raison d'être*. The Chancellor had an opportunity of conferring with Von Lutz about the 14th of August, when on his way to join his imperial master at Gastein, in the Tyrol. The German Emperor had quitted Berlin a few days previously, and, after meeting the King of Bavaria at Ratisbon, had proceeded to Gastein, to hold a personal interview with his traditional political rival, the Emperor of Austria.

This Gastein interview did not fail to attract the anxious attention of all Europe. The ostensible reason for the Conference, partly hinted by the authorities and partly supplied by conjecture, was the settlement of a troublesome question regarding the repudiation of certain railway bonds by the Roumanian Government. The chief holders of these bonds happened to be German capitalists, and the German Government, having remonstrated in vain on their behalf, had made an appeal to the Porte. Bismarck went so far as to revolve plans of possible coercion in the matter, and welcomed an opportunity of sounding Austria as to her willingness to co-operate. But he had other political objects also to attain by a face-to-face conference with Count Beust, the able Chancellor of the Austrian Empire, and one of these was the arrangement of some joint representation—not by any means as a requisition, but as a friendly suggestion—to be made to the Italian Government for the amelioration, if possible, of the Pope's position at Rome. This was a sop by which he hoped to soften the feelings of the German Catholics against him, and to prevent Jesuit intrigues at home from representing him in too black colours. The negotiations at Gastein came to an end sooner than was expected, and further discussion was relegated to a subsequent meeting between the Emperors and their Chancellors at Salzburg on September 6. Again Europe looked on in puzzled speculation, and talked of the old days of the Holy Alliance. No formal league, however, was concluded between the Sovereigns; no technical articles were postulated. The general results of the meeting became known partly through Count Beust's circular to the diplomatic representatives of Austria, partly through the statements of semi-official organs; and from these it appeared that in the matter of the Roumanian railway bonds, the Austrian Government declined to act, alleging that it could not recognize the principle of State interposition to enforce the claims of private speculation, and had no desire to complicate its own relations with so near a neighbour as the Danubian Principality. With regard to the Pope, it was promised that Austrian influence should be exerted to further the course proposed by Bismarck. But the subject that probably lay nearer to the heart of both the negotiating parties than either of those just named, related to the rising tide of Socialism, the great revolutionary element which was threatening all fixed institutions in Europe, and of which the history of France had lately displayed

so terrible a development. It is said that at this Conference a resolution was taken to institute statistical inquiries on the same plan in both empires, as to the nature, tendencies, and extent of the movement, to be followed up, if necessary, by a conference of special commissioners; also that it was agreed to sound the other principal continental Governments as to their willingness to take part in the investigation. For the rest, both interviews, that of Gastein and that of Salzburg, resulted in a cordial understanding between the two Emperors and their chief ministers. Francis Joseph acquiesced in the position which the Prussian Sovereign had taken as leader of Germany, and William the First engaged not to tamper with the German provinces of the Austrian Empire. When the potentates and statesmen on both sides met and compared ideas, it was to recognize that for both powers there existed a common policy which it was their interest to pursue, and which the popular instinct in both nations had already sanctioned.

The month of September was signalized by two religious counter-demonstrations, the anniversary meeting of the German Catholic Societies at Mayence, and, a few days later, the Congress of "Old Catholics" (*Alt Katholiken*) at Munich, convened for the purpose of forming an Anti-infallibility League. On the first of these occasions the Ultramontanes mustered in unusual strength. Many violent speeches were made, and the Austrian National Anthem was sung at the banquet instead of the German Hymn. The political sentiments of the assembly were fittingly expressed in the opening harangue of Bishop Monfang:—"Criminal law," he said, "prevented his delineating the character of Victor Emmanuel in its true colours. The German princes being intimately allied to that individual, he was afraid they would hand him over to the public prosecutor if he ventured to call a spade a spade. It could not be denied that the Catholic cause was just now not in favour with the Imperial Government of Germany and the all-powerful man who directed its action. The old German Empire had rested upon the foundation of the Catholic faith, and been justly called the Holy Roman Empire. All that the Catholics of Germany demanded at present was that the Church should be left to itself. Were it interfered with, the clergy would not be behind-hand in proving that they had the people to back them."

The Congress of "Old Catholics" at Munich was attended by 500 members, who might be held to represent about 100,000 persons of education and position in the German Empire at this time favourably disposed towards the new Reformation, and swaying the sympathies of some millions of the population. There were two programmes of this party now before the public; the programme of the Stuttgart Committee, and that submitted by the Professors to the Munich Assembly. The Professors, in their programme, represented theology as a science and an inquiry necessitating the study of the Scriptures and of the Fathers, in order to a full apprehension of truth. They maintained the authority of a General Council rightly

constituted, and held that its decisions must be in accordance with the above tests. They accepted the Council of Trent, but held that the Papacy had now for a long time been working against that Council. They denounced the Jesuits, the Syllabus, and of course the last dogma, which they asserted to be an act of schism from the Catholic Church. They expressed a hope for the reform and final re-union of the Eastern and other Churches. They desired bishops and clergy who should not be "lords over the heritage," but elective, and under control. The Stuttgart Committee went much deeper into administrative reforms. For its guiding principles it evoked the primitive Church. It demanded the public election of all the clergy from the Pope downwards, and of the deputies to any Council which might be called; it stigmatized "celibacy," auricular confession, adoration of relics and images as crying abuses; it desired "disestablishment," civil marriage, and the exclusion of religion from public schools; it insisted that the clergy should be compelled to comply with the Civil Code, and that the "Old Catholics" should have their share of the Church property. Beneath these expressed opinions, no doubt other tendencies lurked in the minds of many of the advocates of the new movement, tendencies towards a more simply Scriptural Christianity on the one hand, towards an advanced Rationalism on the other.

The *Times* correspondent on the occasion of the Munich Congress says, "The real work of the meeting was done in private sittings, of which we have but scanty reports. Of public sittings there were only two, and these chiefly devoted to rhetorical addresses, setting forth the iniquities of the Roman Church. The most effective speaker on this occasion was Father Hyacinthe, who, although he spoke in French, by the mingled vigour and raciness of his language earned immense applause. He particularly warned the audience against falling into the fashionable error of the times, of either becoming Jesuit or Atheist, or, as he tersely put it, Bhudist or Heathen. The Swiss members, with their plain, unpretending diction, and Professor Schulte, whose rugged Westphalian nature came out fine, likewise captivated their hearers; Professor Michelis, in a tremendous harangue, demolished the Jesuits. Döllinger did not come forward at all in the presence of the *profanum vulgus*. There were nearly 5000 strangers at each of the two public sittings, and the Catholic capital of Germany was not a little stirred up by the singular event; but the impression produced upon the public, when the door shut upon them all, was that much more remained to be done."

The cause of the *Alt Katholiken* had just experienced a triumph in the election of Dr. Döllinger to the Rectorship of the University of Munich. Later in the year he delivered his inaugural address.

The rash attempt of Count Benedetti this autumn, by publishing his "Case" with reference to the Secret Treaty negotiations in 1866, to fix the entire responsibility of that transaction on Count Bismarck, afforded the astute Chancellor occasion for a triumphant

retort. He drew from the receptacle of the German Foreign Office a series of documents which Benedetti had reason to believe were buried for ever out of sight, and made it clear that the first letter of instruction on the subject of Belgian annexation had come to the hapless envoy from Paris on the 16th of August that year, after the French Emperor had, on the 12th, consented, under Bismarck's threat of instant war, to abandon his claim to Mayence and the left bank of the Rhine. Not only did Bismarck possess this Napoleonic despatch of the 16th, but he possessed also Benedetti's reply to it, promising that he would conform as far as possible to the principles laid down, and enclosing a draught Treaty for the annexation of Luxemburg and Belgium. Upon this followed the French rejoinder, proposing certain amendments in the sketch, and, finally, the revised draught, or famous Secret Treaty which Benedetti actually laid before Bismarck, and which Bismarck himself published in August, 1870. It appeared that Benedetti, disappointed at the cold reception his Treaty met with, began to suspect Prussian sincerity. Meanwhile the German Chancellor, it was evident, was playing with the Belgian idea only as long as he was uncertain of the friendly disposition of Russia. Once assured on that head, he turned round, scouted the notion of Belgian annexation as distasteful to Prussia's good ally, England, and succeeded in throwing the onus of the whole transaction on France, damaging her essentially, moreover, by taking the moment of the outbreak of hostilities for the revelation.

The Parliament re-assembled at Berlin on the 16th of October. The Emperor's opening speech was couched in congratulatory language. He announced a short Session, to be mainly devoted to the despatch of current business. He stated that the regulation of the Imperial Budget would be the principal task of Parliament; that the present transitional Budget would, owing to want of time for making alterations, be extended to the coming year; that a gold coinage fitted for general circulation was to be established; and that, relying upon a steady pacification and consolidation of France, the Government considered it practicable to permit the immediate evacuation of the departments which, according to the terms of peace, was to have occurred in May next. In conclusion he thanked God for the improved prospects of Germany.

The most interesting part of his speech related to foreign politics; and his carefully-worded paragraphs respecting Russia and Austria may here be quoted:—

"The world is only doing us justice when attributing to us pacific intentions. I shall always endeavour to strengthen its confidence in the German Empire as a safe and trusty guardian of peace. It is to me a most important and at the same time a most gratifying task to cultivate friendly relations of such a kind with our nearest neighbours, the Sovereigns of the powerful Empires bordering on Germany from the Baltic to Lake Constance, so that the intimate and secure nature of the connexion cannot be doubted by public

opinion in any country. I rejoice to think that the interviews which I had this summer with the Sovereigns of these Empires,—Sovereigns with whom I am personally on such intimate terms,—by strengthening public confidence in a pacific future, will materially contribute to secure it to Europe. The German Empire and the Austro-Hungarian Imperial State are, by their geographical situation and history, absolutely compelled to entertain friendly and neighbourly relations towards each other. The obliteration of the memory of a struggle forced upon us, much against our will, by the dissensions of a thousand years, will give sincere satisfaction to the whole German people.”

The conclusion of the Convention with France which M. Pouyer-Quertier had come to Berlin to expedite, after its long delay, gave the German Chancellor occasion to deliver one of his blunt and uncompromising political expositions. He showed that by this Convention France would have to advance the 20,000,000*l.*, either in cash or in negotiable bills, by eight fortnightly instalments, beginning on the 15th of January, 1872, and ending on the 1st of May of the same year. At the latter date she would also have to pay 6,000,000*l.*, being one year's interest on the three milliards which will still be due, and the interest of which was to be paid in March. In return for this advanced payment Germany would forthwith evacuate the six above-mentioned Departments, on the condition, however, that they were to remain in a state of military neutrality; that no more French forces were to be sent there than such as might be necessary for the maintenance of public order; and that Germany reserved the right of re-occupying the abandoned territory should France be unable or unwilling to abide by her own share of the compact—that is, not be ready with the payment of the eight successive instalments as they became due. But besides this, which was called the Military and Financial Convention, there was also a Customs Convention regulating the admission of the products of Alsace and Lorraine into French territory. These products, with the exception of substances in the nature of food, were to be admitted into France free of all duty till the end of the present year; to pay only one-fourth of the duty paid by German products on entering France during the first half of the year 1872, and one half of the same duty during the other half. By a clause in this second Convention, the Germans consented to restore to France three frontier communes or villages—Raon-les-Eaux, Raon-sur-Plaine, and Igney, with part of Avricourt; retaining, however, all the crown-lands of those districts, especially two forests of great value, and all the communal and private property enclosed within the crown-lands.

In expounding these conditions the Chancellor of the German Empire took care to satisfy his countrymen that, notwithstanding all the diplomatic skill of M. Pouyer-Quertier, and his own anxiety to “do France a good turn wherever he could,” he had secured the best share of the bargain, as, happen what might, he had either insured the payment of the fourth half-milliard, and one year's

interest for the three remaining milliards before they were due, or he had it in his power at any time to regain possession of the six departments now to be vacated. In a military point of view, France, he said, obtained nothing whatever by anticipating the evacuation of these six Departments. He was at great pains to prove that with the Eastern Departments,—i. e. with the whole of the French frontier from Mezières to Belfort,—and the fortresses of Toul and Verdun still in his hands, the position of the Power which is now at home at Metz had lost nothing of its strength. That eastern strip of territory was all that Germany would, at all events, have retained after payment of the fourth half-milliard in May—the only guarantee for the final payment of the remaining three milliards—and what was sufficient security for three milliards must be equally sufficient for three and a half. In his dealings with his conquered enemy he professed to be actuated by no other considerations than those of benevolence. It was not for the interest of Germany, he said, to weaken her neighbour more than was absolutely necessary for Germany's own safety. He seemed to anticipate a renewal of the struggle as sure to follow upon France's recovery from the consequences of her crushing defeat, and to infer that this recovery should not be too rapid and sudden; in fact, that it was rather with a view to check the development of French resources than for the purpose of adding to the resources of Germany that he imposed upon his vanquished foe such a tremendous contribution.

Shortly after the meeting of Parliament, a manifesto was addressed to the Emperor, bearing the signatures of the Archbishops of Cologne and Gnesen, and of eleven other prelates, and complaining of various infractions of the agreement subsisting between the Roman Catholic Church and the Prussian State by the Ministry of Public Worship and Education, and especially of one case in the Gymnasium of Braunsberg, where Government had kept a religious teacher in office despite the remonstrances of the bishop of the diocese on account of his open adherence to "Old Catholic" doctrines. The Emperor replied in curt and resolute terms. He expressed surprise at the bishops' use of language calculated to shake the confidence of his Catholic subjects, and the more so as the Pope had hitherto freely acknowledged the just treatment accorded to the Church in Prussia. He denied that Government had meddled with doctrinal controversies, or done more than its duty in seeking to avert the threatened conflict between Church and State, referring the bishops for a more detailed explanation to his ministers; meanwhile, he declared that whether his hopes of harmonious co-operation in promoting the interests of the new Empire were fulfilled or not, he would continue, as before, to accord to each community the fullest liberty consistent with the rights of others, and their equality before the law. This answer, which was a tolerably sharp rebuke to the Ultramontanes, gave general satisfaction to the rest of the public.

A final move in the great Church and State war of this year was

the adoption by Parliament, at the end of November, of a Bill making it penal for clergymen to abuse their office by political agitation in the pulpit. The Bill was introduced by Von Lutz, the Bavarian minister. It applied to the clergy of all denominations, but, of course, was specially aimed at the restless fanatics of the Ultramontanist school. Throughout the Rhenish Provinces, Prussian Silesia and Westphalia, the kingdom of Bavaria, and certain districts in Baden, Hesse, and Würtemberg, the Roman Catholic priesthood had been in the habit, during periods of election excitement, of delivering "political sermons" to their congregations, in which they described in pathetic terms the situation of the Pope, and urged their hearers to elect the Ultramontane candidate, whom they represented as ready to assist the Holy Father in his trouble. The effect of these sermons on the people was strikingly shown in an inquiry which took place into the elections for the Bavarian district of Rosenstein, and the Silesian district of Pless Rybnik, and a strong pressure was consequently exercised by the Liberals in some of the Federal States—that of Bavaria especially—on their respective Governments, with the object of putting an end to such abuses. In several cases the elections were cancelled; but this was found to be of no avail, for the electors, being still under the influence of the sermons they had heard beforehand, re-elected the same candidates by an even greater majority than on the previous occasion. Legislation was then called in.

Von Lutz, in introducing his Bill, said he had been lately assured by the Bishop of Passau that the Catholic Church had always striven for supremacy in the State, and that if no longer supported by Constitutionalism and Absolutism, it would now turn to the masses. The same bishop had publicly pitied the poor people for being obliged to pay so many taxes at the bidding of the Government. A number of the Bavarian clergy had dared to threaten those with excommunication who circulated an official document issued by the Government on the state of the Old Catholic question. Last, not least, the language of the Ultramontane papers was so virulent that if these things were allowed to go on, all respect for authority must cease, and the country might have to be governed ultimately by exceptional measures. Such being the case, there remained nothing but to curtail the privileges of the clergy, and subject them to the action of the criminal law, even though the offence might have been committed in full canonicals. Criminal legislation having been transferred to the Empire by the individual States, it was to the Imperial Parliament that he applied for redress. Bishop Ketteler retorted that he did not approve the language of the Bavarian Ultramontane papers: but he was quickly silenced by a Southern member who reminded him that the very worst of these journals—a publication, in fact, "which no decent man could be induced to read, so foul and infamous were the contents"—had been distinguished by a special *breve* from the Pope praising it for its services to the Church. The Ultramontanes, upon the whole, kept very quiet during the

debate, which ended in the passing of Von Lutz's Bill by a very large majority.

The new Imperial Coinage Bill passed into law on November 18th. It had been considerably mutilated, however, in its passage through the Federal Council, owing to the reluctance of the smaller powers to renounce their sovereign rights in the matter, and it therefore went but a small way towards the achievement of the uniform system desired by its promoters. Still there can be little doubt that it will be followed up eventually by more thorough measures, and so justify the motto, "Union makes Strong," which each separate piece of money is henceforth to bear on the reverse side of its ruler's effigy. The cause of uniformity had apparently obtained a victory a few days previously, when a debate took place on Herr Lasker's motion for placing the civil and criminal law and the judicial procedure and organization in the various Federal States under the control of the Imperial Legislature. One of the Baden deputies, Herr Eckhardt, began the debate. He said that the want of a uniform code of laws was becoming more and more deeply felt both in North and South Germany. In Baden they had more liberal laws than in Prussia, yet they would gladly accept a common Federal legislation, even at the risk of losing some of their advantages in this respect. Last year two wars had been declared against Germany. The first had been fought and ended with an unexampled success; the second had not yet begun, but it would soon have to be fought also. "Hitherto," he said, "we have kept ourselves only on the defensive; but in this case, as in the other, there are provinces which have fallen away from the State in course of centuries, and which must now be recovered with a strong hand. The struggle is a far more dangerous one than that in France, for the enemy is partly in our own country; but the German nation will bless the hand that removes provincial restrictions, as it did that which gave it peace after the last war. "Therefore," he concluded, "let the young German Empire proceed on the path of progress in the spirit of the Emperor's motto—"Together forward!"' (*Gemeinschaftlich vorwärts*).

The next speaker was the Hanoverian ex-Minister, Herr von Windthorst, who strongly opposed the motion. He said that to vest the judicial organization of the Federal States in the Imperial Legislature would be in effect to reduce each State into a mere administrative body. The purpose of the motion was really to abolish the individual States, and replace them by a single Imperial State.

Lasker replied that the principle of establishing uniform civil and criminal laws for all Germany was not new; it had been formally accepted by the Prussian Minister Manteuffel, and the Hanoverian Minister Count Bennigsen—men who strenuously defended the separate existence of the German States against the central power. It could not therefore be said that the members of the present Federal Council would depart from their duty to

maintain the rights of the individual States, if they transferred the consideration of civil and criminal law to the Imperial Legislature. As to Herr Windthorst's description of the real purpose of the motion, he would advise him not to repeat such insinuations too often. "If Herr Windthorst," he continued, "should succeed in persuading the German people that the unification of the German law was incompatible with the existence of the individual States, this would be simply driving the first nail into their coffin. In reality these States are more powerful than they were before, for they now deal with the legislation of all Germany instead of with that of a small portion of it. The inconvenience of having different laws in different parts of the same country is well illustrated in Prussia, which has not only provincial laws, but a distinct law of succession applicable to Berlin only, and entirely different from that of all the rest of Germany. The Fatherland already has a united army and commerce; it now remains to give it a united system of law."

This Bill was adopted by the Reichstag; but the *Bundesrath*, or Federal Council, refused to pass it; and the rejection of the measure is believed to have been mainly due to the efforts of "Particularists" in the Bavarian and Wurtemberg Diets, who raised a constitutional question as to whether their representatives in the Federal Council had any right to sanction such fundamental changes without authority from the minor Parliaments.

A new arrangement regarding the immovable War Fund was a measure definitively carried this session in the interests of German Unity.

Among the peculiar institutions of Prussia had long been a war reserve fund of thirty million thalers. To suit the political changes of the last few years this arrangement was now to be extended to the whole Empire. Instead of belonging to Prussia, the War Treasury was henceforth to be appropriated to the uses of all Germany: instead of thirty million thalers, it was to consist of forty millions. This sum was to be deposited in gold and silver in the cellars of some citadel, and, lying torpid without yielding interest, it was to wait for the moment when the alarm of war should again call it into action. The debate on the contemplated measure, on the 24th of October, was animated. Though the Bill was sure to pass, a few advanced Liberals could not refrain from enumerating the reasons which it is easy to adduce against burying alive, as it were, such an enormous sum. To their attacks the Prussian Minister of Finance, Herr Camphausen, replied in a long and discursive speech.

"It could not be denied," he said, "that forty millions was a large sum to lock up and a small sum to carry on a war with; but in modern war it was of the last importance to be able to complete a nation's armaments in the shortest possible time. In 1870 France counted upon taking Germany by surprise, and, indeed, based her entire plan upon this erroneous supposition. Who does not remember with what anxiety the Germans counted the days which neces-

sarily intervened between the declaration of war and their troops taking the field? It was for the purpose of making these preliminary armaments with the greatest despatch that the Government required the sum demanded, and it was to prevent a fall in the price of public securities, which must result from large sales on the eve of war, that Government wanted cash, not stock."

Herr von Pfretzschner, the Bavarian Minister of Justice, in his capacity of member of the Federal Council, contravened the objections of a Bavarian Ultramontane. He owned that in assenting to the formation of an Imperial War Treasury Bavaria had taken a step forward in the path of unity. Under the constitution of the Empire, Bavaria paid her own military expenses. After the passing of the new Bill she would have a share in the Imperial funds, thus rendering the efficacy of her military operations dependent upon financial assistance from Berlin. But however great this concession might appear, it was only the inevitable consequence of the treaties which place the Bavarian troops under Imperial command in time of war. Another member observed that if the rate of exchange on London sank only 2½*d.* after the declaration of war last year, Prussia owed this mainly to the possession of a war fund.

The Bill was referred to a Committee, and passed into law shortly afterwards.

With regard to the Budget presented before the Parliament this Session, we give the following statement, condensed from the letter of the *Times'* correspondent at Berlin:—

"The establishment of the German Empire presents the rare instance of an immense political reform accomplished without any additional burden being imposed upon the people. Neither the last nor the present year shows a deficit. In 1870, though a tremendous war interfered with the ordinary life of the nation, the income from the Customs and Excise, which forms the chief revenue of the Empire, fully came up to the estimates; in 1872 the estimates, which in this country are always rather too low, likewise keep to the figures we have been accustomed to in former and, comparatively speaking, quiet times. To give you the principal figures, the Empire is presumed to expend in 1872 110,500,000 thalers. This sum does not represent the total of the German Budgets, but only the money required for Federal purposes. In addition to this common outlay there are the local Budgets of the various States, which for the ensuing year may be set down at something like 260,000,000 thalers, making 370,500,000 thalers the grand total of the German public expenditure. The Federal outlay of 110,500,000 thalers is covered by the Customs and certain indirect taxes, permanently handed over to the Imperial Exchequer, as well as by the direct contributions of the various states. The sums thus accruing run up to 78,000,000 thalers. Accordingly, there remain 32,000,000 thalers to be contributed by the cash-boxes of the various States. This is more than the usual proportion."

Among the sums on the expenditure side, we need here only mention

the estimates for the Army and Navy: to the former, whose amount, on the peace footing was to be 401,000 men, something over 90,000,000 thalers were assigned; to the latter, which it was expressly announced was only to be maintained on a second rate, or defensive scale, 5,000,000. The Diets of the separate States met in November and December. In opening the Prussian House of Deputies on November 27, the Emperor, after thanking the people for the noble attitude they had maintained during the late war, proceeded to point out that, while the maintenance of the national power and security belonged to the German Empire, the Prussian representatives could the more thoroughly devote themselves to the healthy development of the internal institutions. He mentioned the extremely satisfactory financial condition, which would be still more favourably developed. Bills were announced in connexion with the employment of the Prussian State Fund, which in consequence of the formation of the Imperial War Fund was now available for the payment of State debts. Moreover, the increase of the amount of the revenue, and the important surplus of the last financial year, would be additional means for enabling the Government in 1872 to satisfy the requirements of all departments of the Administration to the fullest extent. The speech dwelt upon the further successful development of communal local administration in the provinces. In reference to the agitation on Church questions, it was stated that Government was determined to preserve perfect independence for the State with regard to the administration of justice and the civil law, and at the same time to maintain the legal independence of the Churches and their followers, and to protect the liberty of conscience and faith of all alike. Measures for extending popular education were immediately to be pressed forward.

Favourable to the action of Government as had been the main political issues of this year, we must not omit to notice side by side with the Ultramontane agitation—though not so much in the foreground of national events—some workings of the social-democratic element in public opinion. Herr Bebel's utterance in the first session of Parliament sounded an uncomfortable note of discord at the moment, though Bismarck professed to treat it with scorn. "The aim of the Paris Commune," said Bebel (and his sentiments were echoed in various working men's meetings soon afterwards), "is neither an impossible nor a pernicious one, as it has been erroneously called by a previous speaker. On the contrary, throughout Europe those classes not dead to all feeling of liberty and independence look upon Paris as their staff of hope. Never mind whether or not the insurrection is suppressed; what is doing now at the French capital is only an outpost skirmish, which will be followed up some day by a great European battle. War to the palaces, peace to the cottages, and death to luxurious idleness is, and will ever be, the watchword of the proletariat in all parts of the world."

In the autumn several strikes of workmen took place, notably among the masons at Berlin. The somewhat pronounced insur-

reactionary tendencies of the miners' agitation in Upper Silesia were, as we have before had occasion to notice, if not directly fostered, at least not discouraged, by the Ultramontane priests in their neighbourhood. Towards the close of the year a meeting of working men was convened at Berlin by the "Social Democratic Union." Its objects were announced to be the utterance of a protest against the petty remunerations recently given to the landwehr and reserves, as contrasted with the munificent grants made to certain generals and other officers; and, secondly, the furtherance of some plan for greater industrial co-operation among the Berlin working men. More than one allusion was made to the great disfavour with which a large portion of the Berlin workmen had viewed the later stages of the French war. The Social Democratic Union had protested distinctly against the continuation of the war after Sedan, asserting that the annexation of Alsace and Lorraine could be justified only by the decision of the inhabitants of those provinces. A resolution was enthusiastically carried, condemning the retention, since the establishment of peace, of French prisoners in the cells of German fortresses.

The chief feature in the second part of the programme—the discussion of the most effective means of uniting the Berlin workmen—was the temper the speakers displayed in reference to Dr. Max Hirsch, the well-known member of the *Fortschrittspartei* (Party of Progress), and the proprietor of the *Volks Zeitung*. The doctor had recently denounced the efforts of the Social Democrats as disturbing the normal relations of capital and labour, and urged the working classes to seek a settlement of their economic difficulties by amicable conferences with their employers. In consequence of this the committee of the Social Democratic party sent a special letter of invitation to Dr. Hirsch, asking him to attend the present meeting. This proposal the doctor declined, and his refusal was a matter of much jocular triumph. As the result of the discussion, it was determined that a large congress of delegates from the various orders of workmen should be held at an early date.

On the other hand, the annual autumn meeting of manufacturers at Leipsic took into consideration the interests of the capitalists, and sought to contrive measures for overcoming the hostility of the workmen. Altogether the commercial condition of the country this year was abundantly prosperous. On this subject we again quote the Prussian correspondent of the *Times*. Writing on November 8th, he says, "Not in politics only is this an unprecedented time in Germany. Commercial affairs have likewise assumed an extraordinary aspect in this country. The war did not sensibly interfere with business. Taxes yielded as much in 1870 and 1871 as in the preceding and less disturbed years, and though a large number of the population were absorbed in the unprofitable work of the campaign, it seemed as if the energies of the rest were opportunely doubled to produce the same financial result as before. Since the conclusion of peace, the commercial vitality of the country has been

steadily on the increase. Every branch of trade has been flourishing. Money was wanted, and could be had in unexampled quantities. If there were a shadow to the bright picture offered by the economical condition of the day, it was the scarcity of labour, in every department of manufacture—nay, of human activity. The impetus given to commerce in these prosperous days has led to a result which, as it will be more lasting than a transient increase of demand over supply, deserves to be recorded among the notable facts of the times. We have had a complete mania for the establishment of shareholding companies. The movement opened with the foundation of new banks. These, the moment they were called into existence and began to live and breathe, set to work and created an unlimited number of other companies like unto themselves. The thing has now been going on for five or six months, and as yet there is no sign of exhaustion. After all the financial and commercial institutions set agoing since the summer, there is money enough left for ‘promoters’ to continue the lucrative business of ‘founding’ with unabated vigour.”

The outbreak of the cholera this year in the Prussian dominions caused some alarm. At Königsberg its ravages in the month of August were considerable, and great fears were entertained that it would spread to Berlin. Active precautionary measures, however, were taken, and whether owing to these or to some mysterious action in the causes of propagation, the dreaded advance did not take place to any appreciable degree.

The close of the year found the venerable Emperor in the possession of his usual sturdy health. In the month of December he started with his son, the Prince Imperial, to join a hunting-party in the Hanoverian forest of Gohrde, and twenty-one wild boars fell beneath the prowess of his individual arm.

AUSTRIA.

The history of Austria this year, though free from the record of war or revolution, has to relate one constant struggle on the battleground of the Constitution; and in the antagonism between the rival principles of centralization and Federal autonomy on which it was built, the fabric of the Empire well nigh came to pieces.

The acquiescent tone in which, at Christmas 1870, Count Beust replied to Bismarck’s announcement of the new German Empire, while it indicated the purpose of the Government of the Hapsburgs to remain on terms of amity with its young and powerful rival of the North, gave but a very partial and inadequate representation of the state of feeling throughout the dual monarchy. The so-called “German Party” in Austria had had much to get over when the war of 1866 not only gave Prussia the victory in the field, but enabled her to exclude Austria altogether from the German body-politic. But the pressure which from that time the Slave nationali-

ties put upon the imperial system to give them more and more the privileges of "home rule," threw back the German Austrians in spite of themselves on the interests of their kindred race; and they hailed the victorious contest of Prussia against France as a guarantee for the predominance of that German element which they trusted was to defeat the vicious tendencies of Slavonic Federalism. The Federalists, themselves, on the other hand, were encouraged to still greater efforts in the path of disintegration, by that very event, the Prussian triumph, which now, at the close of 1870, deprived Austrian Imperialism of its last remaining consideration in Germany. The persistent refractoriness of the Czechs in Bohemia, and their refusal to send members to the Reichsrath, had thrown the Ministry of Count Potocki into a minority, and had induced him to tender his resignation before the year came to an end. The Emperor then declined to accept it, and Potocki remained nominally at the head of Cisleithan affairs till the beginning of February 1871, when the growing difficulties connected with the Delegations brought matters to a crisis; and suddenly, to the general surprise, two imperial letters appeared, one to Count Potocki, relieving him of his functions as Minister-President, the other to Count Hohenwart, entrusting that nobleman with the task of forming a new Cabinet. Count Hohenwart was known as an Ultramontane and a reactionist in politics. He represented that section of the German population of Austria—confined to the ranks of the feudal nobility and clergy—which, in the dread of Prussian liberalism, had begun to cast in its sympathies with the Slavonic separatists. But his capacities or special views as a practical statesman were, at the moment, matter of conjecture only.

The Reichsrath met on the 20th of February, and the public looked anxiously for the exposition of the policy by which the new Minister-President proposed to solve the difficult problem of domestic government. He announced himself distinctly in favour of decentralization. The Government, he said, would introduce Bills having for their object a reform of the administrative organization on the basis of the autonomy of Provincial Diets, of the further development of free institutions, and of an adjustment of the relations between Church and State. He asked for reasonable time to embody his views in a definite plan, calculated to promote the internal peace and union of the Empire without violating the Constitution.

By the German party in Austria the policy announced by the Hohenwart ministry was considered of fatal tendency. They gathered together for a party demonstration in Vienna at the end of February, and adopted every means of parliamentary opposition. The Minister's proposal to sanction the levy of taxes for two months previous to the passing of the Budget was negatived, and one month only was allowed. The financial statement was made on the 3rd of March. Though, in introducing it, the Minister, Baron Holzgethan showed that the year 1870 had terminated more favourably than might have been anticipated, he nevertheless had to put forward a demand for a loan of sixty millions of florins (6,000,000*l.*);

and this rude dispersion of the cherished dream that the days of Austria's borrowings were over, made on the public mind an impression by no means favourable to the Cabinet.

The Opposition pursued its game of hampering the Government on every occasion; and their conduct had the effect of somewhat wearying the House, so that by the latter end of March many Members not originally well affected towards what had come to be called the "mysterious Ministry," showed signs of giving it their support. The position of parties in the Reichsrath, at this moment of time, may be described in the words of one of our contemporary journalists.

"The party of the 'Left' in the Reichsrath, i. e. that of the German Opposition, has split up into three sections, each taking up a different attitude toward the present Government. The German Nationals forming the extreme Left, who have lately been organizing public rejoicings for the triumphs of Emperor William over the 'Welsh,' [*die Walsche*] would declare war to the knife against the Hohenwart Ministry, and are ready to break up the Empire should they fail to secure the ascendancy of the Germans over the other nationalities. The second party, that of the Centralist ex-Ministers, such as Giskra, Herbst, Plener, and Skene, although they share most of the pessimist and ultra German ideas of the first, are not inclined to push things to extremities. They know by experience how pleasant it is to stand well at Court, and do not wish by any violent step to render their future return to office impossible. The third section consists of the large landholders belonging to the German party. These, as Germans, share to some extent the distrust of Count Hohenwart felt by the rest of the party, but they differ so much from the preceding sections as to form, under the presidency of Baron Lasser, a separate club, comprising thirty-five members of the Reichsrath. As Centralists they dread the establishment of Federalism; but, on the other hand, they are attached to the Hapsburg dynasty and to the independence of Austria, and would regard as treason any coquetting with a foreign Power, even though a German one. As the Centralist majority in the Reichsrath consists of between ninety and a hundred votes, this third section of Conservatives and Moderates is of very great importance; and should Count Hohenwart succeed in gaining their confidence, his success would be nearly assured. As regards the negotiations going on with the Czechs and the Poles, nothing certain has as yet transpired."

On the 25th of April Count Hohenwart brought before the House his long-promised scheme of Reform. His Bill proposed to grant to the Diets a more extended legislative initiative. It provided that those assemblies should be entitled to vote projects of law relating to matters not already determined by special laws passed by the Reichsrath. Such projects, after receiving the approval of the Reichsrath and the sanction of the Emperor, were to have the force of law in the province by whose Diet they had been adopted. The Reichsrath

should simply be called upon to examine these projects with the view of ascertaining whether they were or were not compatible with the interests of the Empire, and at once adopt or reject them accordingly.

In his Speech introducing the measure, the President of the Ministry laid stress upon the logical, passionless, and law-abiding course pursued by the Government, which endeavoured to do equal justice to all the races of the Empire, and to carry out the fundamental laws both in the spirit and in the letter. The Government, he added, would thus more surely achieve general satisfaction than by suggesting the most ingeniously contrived measure with the pretence of removing old party differences.

The Bill, while it did not satisfy the Czechs outside, whose organs loudly repudiated the notion of the Reichsrath exercising supremacy in any sense over the Diet of the Bohemian kingdom, met with decided and effectual Parliamentary opposition from the Centralists, who rejected, by a majority of 88 to 55, the proposal for conferring on the Provincial Diets the right of initiating measures in the Reichsrath.

This defeat, however, did not suggest to the Minister any thought of resigning his post, the less so as he did not owe his appointment to the majority of the Assembly. He calmly withdrew his proposal, and produced another conferring a large measure of provincial autonomy on Galicia. He was at once asked whether he intended hereafter to propose similar concessions to the other crown-lands of the Empire, as in that case he was merely attempting to carry piecemeal the measure that had been just rejected when proposed to be applied at once to all the component parts of the Empire. Count Hohenwart candidly avowed that such was his intention, and that a similar measure of autonomy must be granted to Bohemia as soon as that important kingdom should make the concession involved in its acceptance. At this announcement the Centralists were thrown into such a state of excitement that the House had to be adjourned, in order that they might deliberate in private on the course they should pursue. The course adopted was to present an address to the Crown respectfully suggesting Count Hohenwart's dismissal.

The Emperor replied that he was satisfied with the conduct of the Minister, and desired the Chamber to co-operate with him in his endeavour to produce harmony among his peoples. What resource remained for an Opposition in a majority in a constitutional country? The more determined members proposed to decline voting the Budget until the Minister's policy had been made clear. But the cooler heads of the Opposition shrank from the adoption of so decided a measure. They were the "Constitutional" party; the Constitution was the only ground on which they could stand. Was it for them to drive the Government into a position from which a *coup d'état* would afford the only retreat positively not humiliating? Such considerations, and the loyal feeling still so common in Austria that the Emperor's Government must be carried on, moved a large

section of the majority to oppose, or at least not to support, the motion for deferring the debate on the Budget, and the motion was lost accordingly.

The Budget finally passed the Upper and Lower Houses of the Reichsrath and the two Delegations by the middle of July. The fund placed at the disposal of the Ministry was increased to 260,000 florins.

This matter settled, Count Hohenwart resolved without delay to carry through the measures of Constitutional Reform on which his mind was set. He dissolved the Reichsrath and the seventeen Provincial Diets by which it was elected, and appealed to a general election in hopes of gaining support for the "Home rule" claims of Bohemia and the other states. In Bohemia, where of the five millions of population in round numbers, three millions were of Czechish and two millions of German origin, the Centralist party was as usual thoroughly at a discount, and expressed their dissent by secession from the Diet; and an address and resolution were unanimously carried by that body, demanding for the Bohemian kingdom the same independent position as had been granted to Hungary by the Constitution of 1867. It was proposed that Bohemia, like Hungary, should be represented in those Delegations in which the common affairs of the whole Monarchy—its foreign policy, its general military organization, and finance—were treated: that she should have at the head of her local Government an Aulic Councillor, responsible to her Diet, but admitted as a Minister into the Imperial Cabinet: that she should reserve to herself full independence in all matters connected with the administration of Justice, Public Instruction, and Worship, and all direct taxation, though in some specified departments of State expenditure a compromise might be effected. The suppression of the Reichsrath was suggested; and the appointment in its place of a Congress of Delegates from the Diets, and of a Senate, half of whose members should be hereditary, and the other half selected from among nominees of the Diets. Finally, it was stipulated that special deputations from the Diets should be charged with the assessment of the burdens each province was to bear as its own share of the common expenditure.

It was evident that the Bohemian Federalists went even farther than establishing the independence of their own province, and aimed at nothing less than a universal demolition of all central authority, giving local autonomy to every fraction of the Empire, a proceeding which would in many instances lay the most advanced and most thriving part of each separate community prostrate at the feet of the most backward and bigoted. A clause in the Electoral Law of 1867 had stipulated that the people should vote in separate categories—as landowners, townsmen, and country people. Votes had been also given to the Universities and the Chambers of Commerce, thus insuring to the educated and the industrial classes a certain number of seats in the Legislature. But by the new arrangement the Uni-

versities and the Chambers of Commerce were to be disfranchised, and the suffrage in the rural districts extended at the expense of the town population. Every thing, in short, was studied to give the utmost ascendancy to the masses, and these had been plied with all diligence by the Ultramontane priesthood, by the reactionary nobility, and by the Minister-President, Hohenwart, with the object of setting them against the Constitution, and inducing them to join in that cry for nationality which, if it had any meaning, must needs bode dissolution to the Austrian Monarchy.

But the promoters of this scheme loftily added that they recognized the legal condition already enjoyed by Hungary; and thereby they gave offence to the Hungarians, who were already alarmed at a project of disruption which would inevitably have taken effect upon the Cis-Leithan as well as upon the Trans-Leithan Slavonic provinces. In Moravia and the Tyrol its fruits began at once to appear. Both these provinces proffered their claim to be placed on the same footing as Bohemia. Hungary was justified in considering the proposed measure as in fact a breach of the Constitutional law of the Dual Monarchy, which had settled her position as well as that of Austria in 1867; and Count Andrassy, the Hungarian Prime Minister, united with Count Beust, the Chancellor of the Empire, in representing to the Emperor the domestic and foreign dangers which would be the inevitable consequence of his returning a favourable answer. But Hohenwart, it appeared, had to some extent pledged Francis Joseph to accept the Bohemian proposals. What was to be done? Could he as a monarch, always tenacious of his word, draw back from any engagement contracted in his name? Beust and Andrassy insisted on having it clearly expressed in the answer about to be returned, that the compact of 1867 needed no recognition on the part of any one, and was not to be altered except in the way pointed out by the compact itself; besides, they said, that the state-right of Bohemia was itself contained in the present Constitution, and could not be treated as a thing altogether apart from it.

These restrictions cut away, as it were, the very ground on which the new Czechish demands were based. Count Hohenwart consented to bring them in clearly in the answer he was to send to the Bohemian Diet. When, however, the wording was submitted, it was found that the point of the answer had been so evaded that what was meant as a restriction of the Czechish pretensions might have been more easily construed into the very reverse.

It was clear that Hohenwart had bound himself to the Czechish leaders, and had given them reason to believe in the Emperor's full acceptance of their plans. They openly boasted that all they had done had been with his Majesty's knowledge and sanction. It was a difficult position for the Emperor, to whom Hohenwart had been an attached and much-trusted adviser. Hohenwart, moreover, was backed up by the influence of the prelacy and a large portion of the high aristocracy. But Francis Joseph took his decision. He summoned into his presence his German ministers and Count

Andrassy, and after ascertaining from them that no further compromise was admissible, promised that his imperial rescript to the Bohemians should contain the express reservations and restrictions which they had declared to be absolutely necessary in order to ensure the sacredness of existing constitutional rights against a daring attempt to get rid of or ignore them. And now an ingenious expedient was hit upon by the Czechs. The Austrian Minister-President, in order to strengthen his position, had obtained an imperial summons for two of their leaders, Rieger and Clam-Martinitz, to attend the Reichsrath. It was arranged that these deputies should endeavour to prevent the Emperor from issuing any rescript at all, in answer to the Bohemian Diet's exposition of state-rights. Then, it was presumed, the case would stand thus: The imperial manifesto opening the Bohemian Diet distinctly recognized the "State-rights" of Bohemia, and expressed a readiness to give to them solemn sanction by the form of Coronation. On this the Bohemian Diet took upon itself to give a lengthy exposition of these state-rights. If now, it was argued, no reference is made to this exposition, but the Czechs are simply invited to choose members for the Reichsrath, they are fully justified in assuming that their interpretation of the state-rights of Bohemia is *de facto* acknowledged without further discussion, and in making their election to the Reichsrath on this basis. However, the intrigues of Rieger and Clam-Martinitz led to nothing, and the rescript was sent off. Then came the difficulty where to find a Minister to countersign it; for Hohenwart, finding that the Czechs were inaccessible to negotiation on the basis laid down in the imperial document, tendered his resignation at the moment he was required to put his hand to it. The Emperor's resource was in the immediate appointment of a provisional Ministry, with Baron Holzgethan at its head, to carry on necessary business. Then he had to cast about for a successor to Hohenwart.

The post was accepted by Baron Kellersperg, who had been at one time Governor of Bohemia, and had in that position shown powers of conciliation and management, though belonging to the Constitutional or German Centralist party. While the public was waiting, the first week in November, for the announcement of the new Minister's programme, it was startled by the news that Count Beust had resigned his office as Chancellor of the Empire. The causes that led to this event seem to have been connected with the recent meeting at Gastein, when Beust's cordial understanding with Bismarck gave rise to the suspicion that he might have been playing the game of German-Austrian interests too decidedly; and the jealousy which this suspicion excited among the Feudalists and Ultramontanes, who had been the main supporters of Count Hohenwart, was strengthened by the choice of the Centralist Baron Kellersperg, to succeed Hohenwart in the office of Minister-President. Altogether, therefore, it seemed to Beust that he should best consult the interests of the Empire by retiring from the prominent

position in the councils of the Emperor Francis Joseph, which he had held for five years, and in which he had acquired a world-wide reputation for statesmanship. He could do so the more safely as he had just fought the battle of the rescript against the Bohemian agitators, and driven the Emperor's unconstitutional advisers from his side. It is said, indeed, that the Emperor resented the energy with which Beust had attacked Hohenwart, and that this displeasure was partly the reason of his retirement. It may be added that another incident connected both with Hohenwart's and with Beust's retirement was the University Commemoration at Vienna, the first week in October, when the vociferous partisanship for Beust and disfavour to the Hohenwart Ministry evinced by the students, while it helped onward the fall of the decentralizing Ministry, on the other hand frightened the aristocratic and High-Church portion of society into the wish for an indemnification. The choice of Count Andrassy, the Hungarian Premier, who had acted cordially with Beust in his late political course, to succeed him, not with the title of Chancellor, but as Minister for Foreign Affairs, certainly did not indicate any intention to reverse his policy in high quarters; and Beust's own appointment to the post of Ambassador in England, on his retirement from the Chancellorship, was a token that no sort of disgrace was supposed to attach to him. Count Andrassy's departure from Pesth, whence he had carried on a very successful administration, was a subject of very wide regret in Hungary. The Right and Left parties in the Reichsrath of that kingdom had been equally kept under restraint by his moderation and ability. Count Lonyay was appointed President of the Hungarian Ministry in his stead.

Andrassy and Kellersperg did not agree. Kellersperg was for giving up all further attempts to conciliate the non-Centralist factions; Andrassy thought a basis of partial concession might still be found without detriment to the Constitution, and preferred, as far as might be, to keep the Slavonic populations in good temper.

Kellersperg, before having his programme approved by the Crown, submitted it to the German Constitutional party; with which, after the overthrow of Count Hohenwart, nothing but a complete reaction from the policy advocated by that statesman could find favour. In the scheme of this party the very idea of concession to the non-German nationalities was to be erased from the articles of political faith. They were to bend without exception, and be broken if necessary. After having become well imbued with such sentiments, Baron Kellersperg presented his rigidly Centralist programme. By its terms all the objectionable Diets were to be dissolved, and his Majesty was to order the great proprietors to choose supporters of the new Ministry, so as to insure a majority. Wherever this did not succeed, and in consequence the Diet refused to send up members, direct elections were to be ordered. Not only no exception should be made in favour of Galicia, but, on the contrary, the Ministers for Galicia should be done away with, and if

the Poles should refuse to come to the Reichsrath, the Ruthenes were to be called in to help in carrying out the direct election. There was to be no Minister-President named, but the place was to be reserved until the Reichsrath should meet, and make its own appointment.

The refusal of Kellersperg to meet in any way the demands of the Poles in Galicia—demands much more moderate than those of the Czechs of Bohemia—was the chief point on which his programme displeased Andrassy, who hoped to find in the support of the Poles that majority for Government in the Reichsrath without which the Constitution could not work. Besides this, the proposed mode of action in elections was clearly calculated to give an invidious prominence to Crown influence; and altogether the scheme was pronounced impracticable by the heads of the Government. Kellersperg retired, and the post of Minister-President was again vacant.

The next occupant of it was Prince Adolf Auersperg—a politician whose reputation and character stood high, though he had but recently made himself a name in state affairs. His brother, Prince Carlos Auersperg, had been the first Austrian Constitutional Minister, in 1867.

On the 21st Prince Auersperg—having previously obtained the sanction of the Crown for his programme, thus reversing the Kellersperg process—presented it before a Conference of the German Constitutional party for approval. It attempted to show the way not only to surmount the present difficulty as regarded getting together the Reichsrath, in a perfectly legal and constitutional manner, but to prevent parliamentary strikes in future.

The objectionable Diets were to be dissolved at once, and new elections ordered. The Bohemian Diet was also to be dissolved, so that even there a chance was given to the Constitutional party to get their interests better represented than they had been.

The Minister for Galicia was to remain, but his sphere of action was to be defined so as not to wear that character of complete separation which it had under the Hohenwart Ministry. All affairs relating to Galicia, to whatever department they might belong, were still to pass through his hands, but the decision of them was reserved to the Council of Ministers. Thus the special needs of Galicia would be taken into consideration without breaking up the unity of the Ministry. The Government, besides, would undertake to propose to the Reichsrath, and advocate, an administrative independence in favour of Galicia not greater than that which a portion of the German Constitutional party itself was ready to grant to them.

Respect and observance of the Constitution were no more to be mere words, but a reality. There would be the legal and constitutional forum, the Diets and the Reichsrath, to redress grievances and fulfil wishes, but the licence for extra-parliamentary agitation, so often carried to rank treason, was to be put a stop to with all the means the law might give, or even by new laws adapted to the

case. And not only were the agitating powers of individuals to be repressed, but the Diets also were to be held perforce in the Constitutional path. There were to be no elections of members to the Reichsrath under protest or reserve; all such elections should be considered illegal. Neither was absenteeism to be tolerated. If a member chosen by the Diet refused to come up he should lose his right, and another should be chosen in his stead. Now Government could, by the existing law, order deputies to be directly elected by the country in case the Diet as such should refuse to send up Members; but there happened to be a flaw in this law, which hitherto had damaged its operations. Thus when the Bohemian Diet, in which the Czechish party had got the majority, refused to elect Members to the last Reichsrath, and direct elections had been ordered, instead of the fifty-four Members to which Bohemia is entitled, only fourteen were forthcoming; the fact being that most of the rural districts elected Czechs from the class of great proprietors, and they, sharing in the general dissaffection, refused to come and take part in the Central Legislature. One point of the programme, therefore, was the addition of a clause that in the case of refusal to serve, the men who had got most votes after the men elected should take the place of the latter. The passing of this clause would put an end to parliamentary strikes, and insure the Reichsrath the full number of members.

The German Centralists, before whom Auersperg laid his programme, would only pledge themselves to support him on condition that the Polish demands should not be brought before the Reichsrath as a Government measure. The Emperor's expressed wish that a Polish Minister should be chosen to represent Galicia in the Cabinet was as yet disregarded, the Poles themselves perceiving that their claims were likely to be met by unfavourable discussion and virtual rejection when the parliamentary battle should begin.

To sanction the proposed changes it was necessary to assemble the Reichsrath for a short session and lay the programme before it. The question was, would a sufficient number of deputies appear to bring the House up to the number of two-fifths, without which no measure affecting the Constitution could be taken into consideration. The policy of abstention had always been found by the malcontents the best way to hamper the wheels of Government, and it was to remedy the inconvenience so often caused by it that the new Constitutional enactments, as we have seen, were in part proposed.

The Assembly met on December the 27th, and the appearance of the benches was eagerly scanned. On the left side sat the Constitutional party, in its usual strength. Then came a great void in the centre. Towards the right the places were more occupied; on the extreme right the Poles made a good show. Dalmatia had sent up no Members, but this arose probably from causes of accidental delay merely. Carniola, Vorarlberg, and the Tyrol were represented, though imperfectly. When the President called on the Members to take the oath, 120 answered to the call, and there was every

expectation that more would come up. The requisite quorum was only 102, therefore it was possible to proceed to business.

On the following day, December 28th, the Emperor delivered his opening Speech. He pointed out that his readiness to grant such extreme concessions as would be compatible with the unity of the State had not succeeded in effecting the desired internal harmony. The Crown, by referring the different provinces for a remedy for their claims to such means as the Constitution offered to them, had not only had in view the right of the whole Empire, but also the real interests and protection of the separate kingdoms. The first task of the Government, which was composed of men belonging to the representation of the entire country, was, the Emperor said, to strengthen the constitutional and legal basis, and to insure every where absolute obedience to the laws. The Government, on its part, would accede to the wishes of Galicia so far as they were confined to that province, and were compatible with the conditions of the unity and the power of the whole Empire. The complete independence of the Reichsrath must be assured by the unbiassed selection of its representatives. The proper means for carrying into practical effect this view of Austrian constitutionality would be submitted to consideration at what should seem the most favourable moment; and it would appear that all interests entitled to representation would be adequately protected. In the meantime Bills would be submitted for the prevention of abuses of the constitutional elections. The Speech from the Throne then recommended the settlement of the educational question. The Government, it was said, intended earnestly, but with moderation, to carry out the laws on primary instruction, and would also decide the pending questions respecting the Universities. The Government would further make certain necessary preparations for filling up the gaps created by the suspension of the Concordat, in legislating on the relations between the Catholic Church and the State. Further, the Government would complete the draught of the Bills on the important questions relating to the civil and criminal procedure of the police magistracy, the general organization of the tribunals, and the institution of a public prosecutor. It was already engaged in drawing up a Bill defining the attributes and conformation of a Court of Administrative Control; and the development of the Landwehr would also be one of its special duties. The Estimates for 1872 would be submitted to the Reichsrath immediately, and proper care taken to prepare the subsequent Budget. The Emperor further announced several Bills on economical and commercial questions, with the view of specially developing the trade of the country and advancing the claims of labour. The Government, he said, was engaged in drawing up Bills to increase the salaries of officials. The amelioration of the pecuniary position of the lower clergy would also be cared for. While pointing out that the unity of political labour was the surest means of harmonizing contradictory interests and of reconciling all parties, the Emperor deplored the

conduct of some portions of the population in declining to be represented on the basis on which alone any understanding was attainable. He urgently exhorted the representatives to devote their undivided efforts to the solution of practical questions, in order to satisfy the material and spiritual wants of the country. The people of Austria, he said, weary of Constitutional conflicts, asked for peace and order, so that they might enjoy the rights so freely secured to them by the Constitution. The present European situation was highly favourable to the consolidation of Austrian internal interests, and it might be hoped that the friendly relations of Austria with foreign Powers would go far to strengthen the maintenance of universal peace.

The Speech concluded by expressing the expectation that the unification of the various peoples composing the Austrian Empire might be successfully achieved on national bases, and in accordance with the spirit of the age.

CHAPTER V.

ITALY.—Rival Courts at Rome—Law of the Papal Guarantees—The Pope's Jubilee—The King's Arrival at Rome—Opening of Mont Cenis Railway Tunnel—Demonstrations at Rome—First Italian Parliament at Rome—King's Speech—Monte Citorio and the Vatican—Financial Statement.

SPAIN.—King Amadeus—Last Session of the Cortes *Constituyentes*—State of Parties—Ruiz Zorrilla—Arrival of the Queen—New Elections—Opening of the Legislative Cortes—Debates—Change of Ministry—King's Tour through the Provinces—More Changes of Ministry—Massacre at Havannah.

PORTUGAL.

BELGIUM.—Riots at Brussels—Fall of the Anethan Ministry.

NETHERLANDS.

SWITZERLAND.—Peace Society—Romanizers and Anti-Romanizers—Reform of Constitution.

SWEDEN.—Army Reform Schemes, &c.

DENMARK.

RUSSIA.—Relations with Germany—Army Re-organization—Black Sea—"Nihilist" Trials—Relations with Roman Catholic Church—Cholera—St. George's Day at St. Petersburg—Pan-Slavism.

TURKEY.—New Black Sea Arrangements—Death of the Grand Vizier—Roumanian Factions—Affair of the Railway Bonds.

GREECE.—King George's Speech to the Chambers in October.

ITALY.

The history of the Italian kingdom this year is singularly prosperous and exempt from vicissitudes. It is chiefly indicated by three or four landmarks in the shape of public events bearing on the

peaceful progress of the newly-cemented State. Soon after the King's short visit to Rome at Christmas, 1870, his eldest son, Humbert, Prince of Piedmont, and the Princess Margherita settled there for some months, and set up a bright and popular Court on the Quirinal. Pope Pius IX. held his rival Court at the Vatican, and indulged himself in complaints at his altered situation, but resisted the pressure put upon him by some of his cardinals to leave the city altogether, and seek an asylum in some more faithful land than the dominions of Victor Emmanuel. "Many here counsel me to leave Rome," he said one day, "but where am I to go? There is not one of the Catholic Powers that would not, after a time, find my presence an embarrassment, so that I should have to wander from one country to another, and it is very hard for an old man to turn vagabond." "I am not inspired to depart," he said on another occasion, in allusion to his newly-defined attribute of Infallibility. The footing on which the dethroned Pontiff was allowed by the Italian Government to reside at the Vatican was defined by a Bill which passed through Parliament in May, commonly called the Bill of the Papal Guarantees. This measure was received with no good grace by the Pope, who of course denied the right of the Italian King to arrange any conditions at all for him; but to his disappointment he found no Catholic monarch willing to interfere actively for the amendment of his position.

The provisions of the Bill were as follows:—The first portion of it related to the personal rights and prerogatives of the Pope, and the second to the relations between Church and State. The person of the Pope was declared to be "sacred and inviolable," and any offence against him to be punishable in the same manner as offences against the King. It was decreed that he should be received by the authorities with royal honours, and was to be given the same rights of precedence as were allowed to him and his representatives in other Catholic countries. He was to have as many guards as he pleased to protect his person and his palace. His annual allowance was to be 3,225,000 lire, the amount charged in the budget of the Papal States for the papal palaces, the Sacred College, priests, congregations, department of the Secretary of State, and foreign diplomatic service. This allowance was declared to be free from all rates and taxes. The Pope was to remain in possession of the Vatican, the Lateran, and Castelgondolfo, with all their outbuildings, furniture, &c.; and both the palaces and the libraries and picture-galleries contained in them were to be inalienable, free from all imposts, and not liable to seizure for public purposes. (This provision of the Bill was amended by the Lower House, in the sense that the picture-galleries and the library of the Vatican should become the property of the nation; but the amendment was rejected by the Senate.) No official or other Government agent was to be allowed to enter any of the papal palaces, even in the discharge of his public duty, without the Pope's permission; and the same rule was to apply to buildings where a conclave or

council should be assembled. The Pope was to be left free to correspond with the bishops and the whole of the Catholic world without any interference on the part of the Italian Government. He was to have a post-office and telegraphic service of his own for each of his palaces; and all the papal seminaries, academies, universities, and colleges in Rome and the suburban dioceses were to be solely under his control. In the second part of the Bill—that referring to the relations between Church and State—the Government gave up the privilege it had hitherto possessed of presenting and nominating persons to offices or benefices in the Church, on the condition that Italian subjects only should be appointed; it also exempted the bishops from the duty of taking the oath of allegiance to the King. The *exequatur* and the *placitum regium* were abolished as regarded all decrees and publications of the ecclesiastical authorities, with the exception of those relating to Church property. It was decreed that no appeal should be allowed against a sentence of the ecclesiastical courts; but, on the other hand, that the civil authorities should not be permitted to assist in any way in executing such sentences.

The unrestricted concession to the Pope of the right of appointing bishops, the entire realization of the "Free Church in the Free State," was a bold conception of Italian statesmanship. Some thought it too bold; but, at all events, it put the Pope in a difficulty. He shrank from any appearance of acting in Church matters in virtue of laws made by Victor Emmanuel, and for a time preferred leaving vacant the sees that fell in, to availing himself of his new privilege to fill them without reference to a royal *exequatur*.

On the 16th of June took place the celebration of the Pope's jubilee. He had completed the twenty-fifth year of his pontificate, and thus outlived the popular superstition, which predicted that no successor of the Apostle should ever "see Peter's years." There was, indeed, a saving clause for those who wished still to maintain the superstition. The Founder of the Roman Church, they said, had been a Prince as well as a Chief Priest in the Eternal City for his quarter of a century; the temporal sway of Pius IX. had come to an end in September, 1870. The jubilee was attended by deputations of the faithful from all regions of Europe, and congratulations were offered by Protestant as well as Roman Catholic potentates. Large offerings were brought of money, and plate, and pious vows. The square of the Vatican was crowded with Roman and foreign equipages. The black and white cross made frequent show among the multitudes. St. Peter's Church was magnificently decorated and lighted up for the occasion. A congregation of 20,000 persons assembled to hear Mass chanted by the Patriarch of Constantinople. But at the solemn service held there one element was conspicuous by its absence. No soldiers stood on guard, as of yore, to testify the existence of the Pope's temporal Power. For the rest, the *Papalini* were allowed to have things much their own way on this day of high festival. Their attempts at exciting popular

feeling against the Government were simply ignored : and, indeed, the popular feeling seemed in no mood to be excited. Very few Roman citizens attended the ceremonies ; the shops were kept open ; the inhabitants pursued for the most part their ordinary avocations. Next day they had a peaceful opportunity of showing that, in spite of priestly and papal denunciations, their hearts were really with the wicked usurper who had put an end to the sovereignty of the Pope-King. The whole city blazed with an *imbandierata*, or display of colours, and the colours were the national colours, the ensigns of Victor Emmanuel. There was scarcely a house that did not show its flag. It was on this occasion that something like a disturbance took place. The national flag was hoisted by the landlord of an hotel in which conspicuous rooms were occupied by the family of an English Roman Catholic nobleman, Lord Gainsborough. Mr. Noel, Lord Gainsborough's son, tore down the flag in anger. The crowd outside witnessed the act, and raised a cry of indignation. The landlord, frightened, had the flag replaced, and it was greeted with shouts of "Viva l'Italia ! Viva Vittorio Emanuele !" "Viva Pio Nono, Papa e Rè !" shouted young Noel in reply, rushing out on the balcony. A riot ensued. Lord Gainsborough insisted on having the flag taken down. The proprietor remonstrated, and refused. Finally, the English political agent and Monsignore Capel arrived, and persuaded the Gainsborough family to leave the hotel by a side-door, instead of advancing in face of the mob, as they had announced their intention of doing.

It was the Pope's fate this year that on every public occasion, the shadow of his evil genius projected itself before his pathway. A week before the Jubilee the Italian minister had issued a circular, announcing that the transfer of the Capital from Florence to Rome was to take place on the 1st of July. On the second day of that month, King Victor Emmanuel was received at the railway-station by his Ministers, by deputations from the Senate and Chamber, by the syndic and municipality of Rome, all the civil and military authorities, and the syndics of all the cities of Italy ; and entering a state carriage, Prince Humbert riding on horseback by his side, he proceeded to the city. The Piazza of the Baths of Diocletian, the Via San Niccolò Tolentino, and the Piazza Barberini, the streets Vie Due Macelli, Condotti, Corso, and Delle Muratti, up to the steps of the Quirinal, were lined by 150,000 persons, and the great majority of this mass were either Romans or natives of the Pontifical States. The whole city was decorated with tricolour flags. Victor Emmanuel wore the uniform of a general, and was accompanied in the carriage by his aide-de-camp, General de Sonnaz, by the President of the Council of Ministers, and by Prince Pallavicini, syndic of Rome. Other carriages followed, and the procession was completed by an escort of the cuirassiers, or hundred guards, and the mounted National Guard. A tumult of cheers hailed the cortège along the whole route, while from every balcony and window and housetop throngs of women showered bouquets on their elected

S

sovereign. The King no sooner alighted at the Quirinal than he responded to the shouts of the multitude by appearing on the balcony and delivering a congratulatory speech. Then followed a grand banquet, a visit to the Theatre Apollo, an illumination, and next day a review, a ball at the Capitol, and a torchlight return to the Quirinal. The patriotic dream of Machiavelli might seem at last fulfilled.

The opening of the Mont Cenis Railway Tunnel, on the 17th of September, was an occasion of festive rejoicings at Turin. The completion of this great work was indeed an era in the history of engineering, and it reflected distinguished credit on the Italian energy and enterprise which had carried it through. The work had been originally taken in hand by Sardinia, with but inadequate means, in 1857. When Savoy fell to the French, in 1860, the Government of Napoleon III. offered to help towards the expense, increasing the rate of subsidy according to the rapidity with which the works should be pushed on. But after the consolidation of North Italy, in 1866, France took fright about the Mont Cenis railway, and threw every hindrance in the way of its completion, lest the continued line to the East, by way of Brindisi, should cut out her own Marseilles route. As it happened, the delay which she did in fact interpose for five years, helped to turn attention to other possible ways of access to Brindisi, and, in particular, induced the Italian Government to grant ample subsidies to the Swiss line of the St. Gothard. Italy had engaged, by the Convention of Berne, to contribute as much as 45 million francs to this work, the remainder being supplied by the German States and the Swiss Cantons. In a parliamentary debate, which took place in June this year, the Opposition urged that Italy had been taken in for too large a share of the expense, and a counter-line by the Splügen was suggested as more advantageous to her interests. An obstinate struggle was made on the subject, and the Government only carried their own point, of adhesion to the Berne Convention in favour of the St. Gothard line, by making it a Cabinet question. It is supposed that this line, partly from its political and partly from its geographical position, will possess advantages to the trade and intercourse of the whole world, even superior to those which are already secured by the Mont Cenis route.

There was some apprehension of a riot at Rome on the 20th of September, when the anniversary of the entry of the Italian army was celebrated by the troops and National Guards, and by the Trade Societies of the city. The King being aware that the Ultramontanes had made an alliance with the Republicans, and that a proposal was on foot for proclaiming the Republic from the Capitol, addressed himself to Garibaldi, and exhorted him in the name of their common country and the perils they had both encountered on the same battle-fields, loyally to give his aid to the maintenance of the monarchy and the tranquillization of the public mind. In obedience to the wishes of the King, the old general

sent his son Ricciotti to Naples and Rome. In these two cities Ricciotti put himself in communication with all the leading men of the Republican party, and implored them to avoid a premature proclamation of the Republic, which, as matters actually stood, could be profitable only to the priests. He also visited the neighbourhood of Rome, and urged his representations with skill and tact at Albano, Genzano and Marino, where the Republicans were numerous. In fine, he passed the day of the 20th of September at Rome, watching over the maintenance of order. The frank and loyal support accorded by Garibaldi to the Italian Government entirely destroyed the plot, and the consequence was that complete tranquillity characterized the anniversary at Rome in particular and in Italy generally. But it was rumoured that large numbers of Revolutionists, Communists, and Internationalists had availed themselves of this occasion to make their way into the Capital, and that they were preparing a plot of alarming proportions to burst into action during the course of the autumn. It was a relief to many minds when the "Working Men's Congress," in the first week of November, promoted by Mazzini, through the agency of the Ligurian Societies, turned out after all a very harmless affair. Many societies in the principal cities refrained from sending deputies to the meeting. The Roman workmen of all classes held aloof. Seventy-one delegates only appeared, and these fell out amongst themselves. Among them was a small number of avowed Internationalists, who, finding they could not carry their own extreme views, broke away and absented themselves altogether from the last sittings. A portion of the delegates declared themselves disbelievers in the political creed of Mazzini, and stated that if, as some desired, it was promulgated as a *dogma*, the societies they represented would be obliged to withdraw from connexion with the rest. Others protested against politics forming any part of their deliberations, on the ground that the societies which had delegated them had only given them power to discuss questions relative to the moral and material interests of their class. The general result seemed to show that for the present, at least, Italy had nothing to fear from revolutionists, whether Republican or International; that the Roman working men were indisposed to accept Mazzinian infallibility in exchange for the Papal infallibility they had rejected. It would appear that a letter of Garibaldi's, written on the 21st of October, and showing the wide divergence of opinion, if not actual dissension, existing between himself and Mazzini, contributed much to the complete failure of this attempt to make Rome the centre of the revolutionary movement.

The demonstrations at Rome this year continued to present a series of the sharpest contrasts. A few days before the Working Men's Congress the Pope had held his Secret Consistory, for the purpose of at last filling up the vacant sees in the Italian kingdom, and took the occasion to deliver an "Allocution," inveighing against the iniquitous proceedings of the Italian Government, repudiating the

Papal Guarantees, claiming to act, not in virtue of any boon accorded to him by the King of Italy, but by his indefeasible authority as Vicar of Christ, denouncing the opponents of the Œcumenical Council and the State Ministers who had protected them; and, *per contra*, according his approval to the Archbishop of Munich and the other Infallibilist prelates. On this side of things, indeed, he had a sense of triumph to console him. Before the year closed, every surviving bishop who had resisted the Infallibility dogma at the Vatican Council, had recanted, with the sole exception of Strossmeyer. About the "Preconization" he still hesitated, in spite of his Allocution, and the ceremony did not take place till December, when 28 Bishops—19 of them Italians and 3 French—were appointed, under the new constitution of ecclesiastical affairs.

The crowning ceremony of this year of demonstrations was the inauguration of the First Italian Parliament held in Rome, on the 27th of November. King Victor Emmanuel opened the Chambers in the great Hall on Monte Citorio, with an impressive speech, during the delivery of which his voice was frequently broken with emotion. The opening paragraphs were composed entirely by himself. "The work to which we have consecrated our life," he said, "is completed; after long expiatory trials Italy is restored to herself and to Rome! Here, where our people, after the dispersion of many centuries finds itself for the first time assembled in the majesty of its representatives; here, where we recognize the country of our thoughts, every thing speaks to us of greatness, but every thing at the same time reminds us of our duties: we shall not forget them in the joys of this day." The King continued to the following effect:—

"Regenerated by liberty, we shall seek in liberty and order the secret of strength and a reconciliation between the Church and the State. Having recognized the absolute independence of the spiritual authority, we may be certain that Rome, as the capital of Italy, will continue to be the peaceful and respected seat of the Pontificate. We shall thereby succeed in reassuring the consciences of men. Thus, by the firmness of our resolution, and the moderation of our acts, we have been able to accomplish the unity of the nation without detriment to our friendly relations with foreign Powers. The Bills which will be laid before you to settle the future position of the ecclesiastical corporations will be in harmony with Liberal principles; they will only relate to bodies and landed properties subject to the law, leaving untouched those religious institutions which have a share in the Government of the Universal Church.

"Now that Italy is constituted we must devote our attention to rendering her prosperous by restoring her finances. Financial men will furnish us with the means of strengthening the military organization. My most ardent wishes are for the maintenance of peace, and nothing leads us to fear that it will be disturbed; but the renewal of the national armaments and the works for the defence of our territory require long and searching studies. The future

might call us to a severe account for our negligence. Propositions relating to this subject will be submitted to you."

Various Bills concerning the internal administration were then enumerated. Hopes were expressed that the accomplishment of the national unity would, as one of its results, render party struggles less fierce. The King expressed his satisfaction at seeing the population give proofs of love of work, and said that the economical movement must be encouraged, scientific and technical education must be extended, and fresh means of communication and outlets for commerce must be provided.

"The tunnelling of Mont Cenis," he said, "is completed, and that of St. Gothard is about to be undertaken. Those enterprises will facilitate and increase the friendly relations which already unite us with other countries, and will render more fruitful the legitimate emulation of work and civilization."

Again a rival manifestation. At the same hour that Victor Emmanuel entered the Chamber on Monte Citorio, the halls of the Vatican, in the words of the Papal organ the *Osservatore*, were crowded by the *élite* of the Roman patriciate, of the *bourgeoisie*, and of the resident foreigners, come to offer condolences and good wishes to the deposed Sovereign of the Eternal City. The *Osservatore* thus describes the close of the Speech in which Pius the Ninth replied to the addresses of his visitors:—"He condescended finally to speak of that conciliation blated forth by the impious, who had even ventured to foreshadow it by allusive pictures, that so-called conciliation by which the enemies of God hope to conquer our noble resistance and disarm our holiest rights; and here, raising his voice, he protested solemnly that no 'conciliation' would ever be possible between Christ and Belial, between light and darkness, between truth and falsehood; then, with eyes and arms uplifted to heaven, he prayed the Omnipotent to sustain the force of His Vicar in the hard struggle, and fortify by Divine aid his constancy, offering to sacrifice his life sooner than yield to the insane devices of triumphant iniquity."

That—whatever might be the ultimate hopes of the men who followed the moral guidance of Garibaldi or of Mazzini—there existed at this time among the anti-papal Liberals of Italy a party earnest in religious conviction, is evidenced by the utterances of such men as Bettino Ricasoli and Terenzio Mamiani, the former a statesman of mark and of experience, the latter a statesman also, but better known as a man of letters, a philosopher, and a poet. "If the (ecclesiastical) reformation is to become what we desire," wrote Ricasoli to the editor of the *Esaminatore*, "its aims must be explained with clearness and moderation, so that the number of its adherents may increase from day to day. The reformation will be victorious whenever the conviction of its necessity has taken a firm hold of the majority. In this way great revolutions are effected in our age. To bear on high the banner of a reformation which is destined to elevate the hearts and minds of the people is a duty of

every one who has a feeling for the good and the beautiful. It is our duty to support the reformation decidedly and with all our powers; the success and the reward are in the hands of God. A good Christian and a good citizen must, I believe, act thus; and thus the *Esaminatore* is acting, and therefore its efforts will not remain without success." To an American Episcopal clergyman Mamiani wrote, "I quite agree with you when you say that the aim of the reformatory movement in Italy is not to render Italy Protestant nor to establish here a Church similar to the Anglican, but that it is a Catholic reaction against the Romanism which has too long ruled and corrupted the Latin Church. I have grown old in this conviction. The anti-papal reformation has become very difficult since the last decisions of the Council; for, in order to give the movement new hope and strength, it will be necessary to combat the Œcumenical character of the Council of the Vatican, and to revive with greater skill the great and salutary idea of the Council of Constance, that of making the Pope what he was in the brightest ages of Christianity, *primus inter pares*. The apprehension may indeed be entertained that it is too late. Romanism has in Italy produced three lamentable results—superstition among the common people, indifference among the other classes, and unbelief among most thinkers and writers. But the first thing that was necessary to render a Catholic reform possible was the fall of the temporal power of the Pope, and Providence has made us the happy witnesses of this great event."

We close our survey of Italian history this year with some account of the financial statement presented to Parliament by Signor Quintino Sella, the Finance Minister, on the 12th of December. The statement showed a total deficit, including the new expenses to be incurred for the reorganization of the army and navy, of from 148 to 160 millions of lire. Signor Sella gave a lengthy explanation in reference to the financial management of all branches of the Administration during the last ten years, and enumerated the large increase in several taxes, and the progress made in the sale of the national domains. He next pointed out the economical advance of the country, and referred to the returns of imports and exports, the latter having risen in value to one milliard of lire, and being in excess of the imports, the total commercial movement having increased by two-fifths. The Minister then showed that the revenue derived from the taxes, exhibited an enormous increase, and stated that during the previous ten years the produce of the taxes had augmented from 160 millions to 500 millions of lire, and the revenue derived from State monopolies from 175 to 296 millions. The grist tax yields at present $4\frac{1}{2}$ millions of lire per month. Signor Sella then spoke of the revenue of the postal and telegraph administration, and mentioned the increase derived from the railways. He explained the present state of the National Debt, saying that Italy had redeemed a portion of her rentes; and he entered into many details on that point. Finally, he brought forward several proposals for the improvement of the service of the Public Treasury by the

assistance of five bankers. He further proposed that the circulation of the National Bank should be increased to 1000 millions. He announced that the Budget would contain several new taxes, amounting to 30 millions of lire, the principal of which would be laid upon woven goods and petroleum, and would also comprise some new registration and stamp duties. He further announced an optional conversion of the National Loan into Consolidated Rentes, and a financial operation in connexion with ecclesiastical bonds, which would result in a diminution of the debt due by the State to the National Bank. The realization of these proposals would together yield 730 millions of lire, which are required to cover the deficit of the next five years. The Minister, referring to the general improvement of the public credit, proposed that the issue price of the Rente should not be under eighty-five. In conclusion, Signor Sella said "that Italy must now be peaceful and conservative. She must learn how to wait. When a country had realized the aspirations of many generations, it became her duty to guard against the destruction of what she had attained."

This financial statement was received most favourably.

SPAIN.

Amadeus of Savoy, the new King of Spain, entered Madrid on the 2nd of January. The funeral of Prim, the able soldier-statesman, who had paved his way to the throne, had taken place on the previous day. Amadeus, immediately on his arrival, went to the Atocha Church, where Prim's remains lay; then, after taking the oath of fidelity to the Constitution in presence of the Cortes, he visited Prim's widow. As he rode on horseback to the palace, these duties performed, his courageous composure, amidst the terribly trying circumstances attending his assumption of his new dignity, made a strong impression on the people; and "*Viva el Rey!*" was enthusiastically shouted along his pathway.

The scene in the Cortes was impressive. On a table near the President, Ruiz Zorrilla, lay the sceptre borne by Charles V., and the crown. A new dynasty was now to follow the long line of the Austrian and the Bourbon monarchs. Marshal Serrano stepped forward and read the formal resignation of his office as Regent of the kingdom. Then President Zorrilla, in a short address, announced the dissolution of the *Cortes Constituyentes* of the Revolution.

Prim's policy had rested on that personal ascendancy which enabled him to hold in combination the three rival parties of the Unionists, the Progressists, and the Democrats. The coalition cabinet which he constructed was meant only as a compromise, to last until a constitution should be voted and a king elected. It was intended that as soon as the new monarch should assume the reins of authority, all the provisional powers of the Government should be resigned into his hands, and a new administration be appointed by him, with the tacit understanding that Prim was to be its Presi-

dent. Prim's death altered the situation. Serrano, indolent by nature, and now advanced in age, a Unionist by his political antecedents, found himself reluctantly compelled to take Prim's place, and carry on the Government till such time as by a new election the Legislative Chambers should have replaced the Constituent Cortes, and given the King the opportunity of choosing his own advisers from the ranks of the majority. The new Cortes was appointed to meet at the beginning of April. Meanwhile, Serrano attempted to continue the policy of conciliation, and recruited his cabinet chiefly from among Prim's former colleagues.

The hidden assassins who had compassed the death of the late chief made it known by anonymous threats that their victim was but one among several they had marked out. "We are completely satisfied with our work, and intend to continue in the same road," was the text of an anonymous letter received by Prim's widow on the very day of his burial in the church of the Atocha.

At the head of the Progressist party, after Prim's death, stood Ruiz Zorrilla, a man of considerable ability and indomitable energy. He took the hint of danger, and surrounded himself by a body-guard of police whenever he appeared in the streets. It so happened, however, that on February the 18th Zorrilla received a message to the effect that if he could appoint a meeting on the morrow with certain parties unknown, he should receive important revelations regarding Prim's murder. Accordingly he waited till past midnight, as in a selected house in the Calle Pez; and, no one appearing, was returning to his home in the company of a single friend, when they were both shot at from a dark corner. Seven balls passed behind them, but without touching them. The assassins escaped. Subsequently four men and one woman were arrested by the police; but their arrest led to no practical result, and the threatening letters continued to appear.

The dangerous illness of the young Queen, Maria Vittoria, at Alessia, on her way to her new kingdom, threw a shadow on the career of King Amadeus for a while. After some weeks' delay, however, her journey was resumed, and Amadeus met her at Alicante in the middle of March, bringing her safely to Madrid on the 19th of that month. The King's visit to Alicante proved the occasion of a very joyous and loyal reception, and the Queen created enthusiasm by presenting to the inhabitants her infant son as heir to the throne. On arriving at Madrid, the royal pair were received with renewed rejoicing. On the triumphal arch through which they passed were inscribed the words, "Viva la Soberania Nacional!" They went to hear a *Te Deum* in the church of the Atocha, and then proceeded in an open coach-and-four to the palace, along the Prado, Calle Alcalá, Puerta del Sol, and Calle Mayor. Good order reigned every where; but ominous growlings were heard from the opposition Press.

The new Cortes met on the 3rd of April. The result of the elections was thus estimated; in the Congress, or Chamber of

Deputies, 50 Carlists, 45 Republicans, 15 Moderates, 13 Montpensierists, 230 Ministerialists. In the Senate; 2 Dynastic Moderates, 3 Montpensierists, 6 Moderates, 8 Republicans, 132 Ministerialists. Signor Olozaga was elected President of the Chamber of Deputies. The King in his opening Speech said, "I am pleased to be able to manifest before you, representatives also of the country, the sentiments of my grateful soul, in which day by day is strengthened my resolve to consecrate myself to the difficult and glorious task I have loyally and voluntarily accepted, and which I will preserve so long as I enjoy the confidence of this loyal people, on whom never will I attempt to impose myself (*que conservaré mientras no me falte la confianza de este leal pueblo, á quien jamás trataré de imponerme*). Isolated completely from political struggles, the offer of the illustrious Crown of Castile was a surprise to me. If it would have been on my part a boldness to aspire to it, it would have been an insult to have refused it, when the spontaneous will of an heroic people associated me by their votes with the work of their regeneration and aggrandizement." He added, that having secured the consent of Victor Emanuel, his father, and the assurance that the peace of Europe would not be compromised by his acceptance, he had listened to the overtures. "With these titles, although my personal modesty resists, I proclaim aloud my right, which is an emanation from the right of the Cortes Constituyentes. I consider myself invested with the only legitimacy reason admits, the legitimacy born of the spontaneous will of a people, arbiters of their own destinies." He then alluded to the situation of the Holy See, with which he expressed his hope soon to re-establish a good understanding; to the Cuban rebellion, which he trusted soon to see at an end; to the financial measures about to be proposed by Government. On this subject he said, "the fulfilment of strict and unavoidable duty is the right of all, and required of all, governors as well as governed. With especial interest the Government will propose for your careful attention the question of finance. The credit of the Treasury being the base of the public credit, and the prosperity of all being affected by the augmentation and security of the public wealth, there will be presented to Congress, as soon as its constitution permits, the General Estimates (*presupuestos*), where the economies practised, the reforms of the service, and of the debt, and the development of the public resources, will afford to your patriotism the opportunity of diminishing the difficulties which now surround our finance, and of dispelling the fears its future inspires." The concluding part of the King's Speech was as follows:—

"On entering Spanish territory I formed the determination to mingle my ideas, my sentiments, and my interests with those of the nation which has chosen me as its Head, and whose proud character will never consent to foreign and illegitimate interferences. Within my constitutional sphere I will govern with Spain and for Spain, with the men, the ideas, and the tendencies legitimately indicated to me by public opinion represented in the majority

of the Chambers—the true regulator of Constitutional Monarchies. Assured of your loyalty as I am of my own, I have confidently delivered to my new country all that I most love in the world—my wife and my children; my children who, though they first saw the light in a foreign land, will have the good fortune to receive here their first notions of life, to speak, first of all, the language of Castile, to be educated in the national customs, and to be inspired from their earliest years by the high examples of constancy, disinterestedness, and patriotism which the history of Spain has displayed like a luminous track through all centuries. Placed by the will of the country in my post of honour, my family and I have come here to share your joys and your sorrows, to feel and think as you feel and think—to unite, in short, with indissoluble links, our fate to the fate of the people who have entrusted to me the direction of their destinies. The work to which the nation has called me is difficult, but glorious; perhaps superior to my strength, though not to my will; but, with the help of God, who knows the rectitude of my intentions, with the aid of the Cortes, which will ever be my guide—for it must ever be the expression of the country—and with the aid of all good men, whose co-operation will not be wanting to me, I trust our united efforts will obtain their reward in the prosperity of the Spanish people.”

The Speech was received with much applause. It was remarked that the young King gave special emphasis both by dramatic attitude and forcible expression to the word *jamas*, “never,” when speaking of his resolution not to impose himself on the people contrary to their desires. It was a clause he had himself inserted in the Speech.

One of the first measures of the Cortes was to repeal the sentence of banishment which had been somewhat hastily imposed on those superior officers in the Spanish army who had refused to take the oaths of allegiance to the new King. Foremost among them was the Duc de Montpensier, who had addressed a letter of remonstrance to the Assembly from Port Mahon, the place of exile, demanding the right to take his seat in consequence of his late election for the district of San Fernando. This being accorded, Montpensier presented himself shortly afterwards as one of the legislators of the new Monarchical Government. On the 16th and 17th of May, Señor Moret, the Finance Minister, presented his Budget. He estimated the revenue of the next financial year at 588,000,000 pesetas (23,520,000*l.*), showing an increase of 46 millions, and the expenditure at 629 millions, showing a decrease of 106 millions. Having made this statement, he announced that a loan of 60 million pesetas (2,400,000*l.*), bearing interest at three per cent., would be issued to cover the actual deficit. Differences arose, however, between the Minister and the Committee appointed to consider his Budget; and the following month Señor Moret resigned. His resignation was soon followed by that of the other Ministers. The debates on the Address, in answer to the King’s Speech, had been stormy. The Address itself was carried at last by 164 votes to 98,

and a subsequent ministerial measure for a levy of 35,000 men to fill up the army, was likewise carried by a still larger majority. A previous quarrel about the anti papal demonstrations on the day of the jubilee had also ended in their favour. The Carlist-Catholic party blamed Government for the riot. Government complained of the provocation given by the Carlists, and cited the following utterances of their daily papers:—

“As the Virgin Mother of the Saviour of men crushed with her pure feet the head of the infernal Serpent, so Pius IX. will also crush with his Syllabus the head of Liberalism, the true serpent of the 19th century.”

“The first Pope was St. Peter; the last is Pius IX. There have been 42 anti-Popes—the first was Novatianus; the last was Amadeo, Duke of Savoy!”

Señor Mansi came to the aid of Government, and moved, “That the Congress, while condemning the conversion into a political movement of a manifestation of the religious spirit of Madrid, reproves energetically the excesses committed, and offers all its support to the Government to maintain order,” &c. After a debate, prolonged till nearly two on Tuesday morning, this motion was approved.

As on none of these subjects Government had suffered a defeat, it was matter of surprise when Marshal Serrano abruptly announced to the House the determination of the whole Cabinet to retire. The King, when the resignation was tendered to him, expressed his astonishment. He declared that as a Constitutional King he could only recognize changes in his Cabinet effected by Constitutional means. He had seen no voting in the Cortes in which the Ministers had been defeated. He could understand their resignation by virtue of a defeat in Parliament, but not otherwise. He, therefore, refused to accept it; but intimated his willingness to receive the Presidents of both Chambers to know what they had to say. The two Presidents, Santa Cruz and Olozaga, confirmed the King in the opinion that the resignation of the Ministry was not the result of any Parliamentary defeat. Accordingly he persisted in his refusal to accept it. When the ministerial explanations on the subject were tendered to the Cortes, Serrano was the spokesman in the Lower House. He reminded it that the present Ministry was formed when the body of General Prim was yet warm, and that one of the Ministers had only entered it on condition of retiring after the elections. Serrano had himself begged that Minister to remain until the close of the debate on the Royal Message. The amendments to the Message had occupied much time. Meanwhile, Señor Moret, the Minister of Finance, in consequence of questions which arose in the Committee to which his Budget was referred, resigned his post. Believing it was best to leave the chief of the State in complete liberty to nominate a Ministry which could govern more satisfactorily than the present one, they had all presented their resignation, but his Majesty, after hearing the Presidents of both Chambers, declared

the crisis to be unparliamentary, and that they should continue in their posts. Under these circumstances, the Ministers had decided to respect the will of the Crown. He had himself thought that a Cabinet might have been formed out of one of the fractions of the Chamber only, but his views had changed under the aspect which the majority had recently presented. He now believed no other Cabinet possible but one of conciliation,—that is to say, composed of representatives of the three factions—Unionists, Progressists, and Democrats. This was indispensable so long as the formidable parties which opposed the present Ministry continued their attacks, so long as they neither “adhered nor resigned.” In accordance with this intimation, Serrano attempted to form a new Coalition Cabinet, but he failed in his negotiations; and the failure confirmed him in his resolution of resigning.

The task of forming the new Ministry was entrusted to Zorrilla. It was composed of Progressist materials. Ruiz Gomez took the portfolio of Finance, Sagasta that of Foreign Affairs, Admiral Malcampo that of the Colonies. On the 26th of July they announced the following programme to the Cortes:—

“The Ministers bind themselves to the most absolute respect to the Constitution, and the laws and rights sanctioned by it. They will maintain public order at any price. They will endeavour to establish harmony between the Church and the State, without renouncing any of the reforms introduced by the Constituent Cortes. They will lay before the Cortes at the first meeting a budget balancing the revenue with the expenditure. They will to the best of their abilities live on friendly terms with all foreign nations, especially with Portugal and the Republics of Spanish origin. Finally, they will maintain the integrity of the Spanish territory, and spare no sacrifice to put an end to the insurrection in Cuba, which, happily, is already almost entirely subdued.”

This programme was received with applause by the Cortes, which afterwards agreed to an adjournment to the 1st of October.

It was now hoped that a stable Ministry had been really formed, and that the confusion of political affairs in Spain was settling down. The new Minister of Finance issued a circular, promising vigorous and useful reforms. He proposed that all those who had employment under the Government should not be liable, as hitherto, to lose their appointments through the change of Government, and to give place to the political friends of an incoming Ministry, who thus used to reward their faithful followers. Incompetence, dishonesty, and indolence would be punished with the utmost severity, regardless of any influence which might be brought to bear in their favour. Promotion would be regulated on the same principles, as well as salaries and other emoluments. The Minister called upon all heads of offices to inform their subordinates that every thing would depend upon their exertions and zeal. He also proposed in this circular to do away with another source of weakness to the finances, namely, the abominable robberies by officials whose pay was insufficient to

enable them to keep body and soul together—a practice which had been winked at by Government, and often not noticed even in the most glaring cases. He counted upon obtaining a double amount of income from land taxes, stamp, and other duties after these reforms should have been effected. He finished by acknowledging the great difficulties in his way, but exhorted all functionaries to assist him by their zeal, honesty, and intelligence.

In the month of September, the King made a tour through the Southern and Eastern Spanish Provinces. He and his young wife had already gained favourable opinions for themselves in Madrid by the frank, fearless, and unpretending way in which they had gone about among their people. His visit to Valencia, Barcelona, Saragossa, and several other cities at this time, gave the Spanish populace the opportunity of testifying very enthusiastic sentiments in his favour. He was accompanied, on part of his tour, by his brother, Prince Humbert of Piedmont, who had come over to visit him. At Saragossa, the King had an interview with the venerable Espartero, Duque de la Vittoria, who addressed him, bareheaded, with the assurance, that though his broken health had not permitted him to come to Madrid, he accepted him faithfully as King of Spain, elected to that dignity by the national will. The personal appearance and habits of King Amadeus at this time are thus described by an eye-witness:—

“King Amadeus is not handsome, and some people object to him, as Voltaire did to the kings of Shakspeare, that he is not ‘sufficiently royal.’ But his appearance has something taking about it notwithstanding, for his air is intelligent and good-natured, and his bearing frank, even to homeliness. He is tall, thin, dark, with irregular features, with a forehead high but narrow, good dark eyes, a longish nose, not classical, a rather prominent mouth, a small blackish beard—a man of the South and of Italy.

“Most of the anecdotes floating about regarding King Amadeus are in illustration of the simplicity and domesticity of his Court. When he came to Madrid he found that one side of the palace was reserved for Spanish queens. But his Majesty explained that he and his consort lived together (*felices ter et amplius*), and that he did not wish to change his habits. An hour suffices for the royal dinner; and the personal activity of the Sovereign is such as becomes a man who is at once a sailor and a soldier, a horseman and a swimmer. Every body with any pretence to it has had access to him during this journey.”

The King returned to Madrid at the end of the month, in time to reopen the Cortes on the 2nd of October. It was then, to the disappointment of all friends of settled order, seen on how slight foundations the existence of the Zorrilla ministry reposed. The first question started was, of course, the election of a President for the Assembly. Government nominated Señor Rivero for the post. The Opposition proposed Señor Sagasta. The Ministerial candidate was outvoted by 123 votes against 113. Zorrilla at once resigned,

regarding this as a vital defeat. After consulting with Sagasta, and vainly summoning Espartero to his Council, the King endeavoured to form a Ministry of transition under the Presidency of Señor Malcampo. Malcampo took office on the 5th of October. In the middle of the following month, a motion of want of confidence was introduced into the House by the Zorrilla party, and a new Cabinet was formed, under the presidency of Sagasta; but as the Sagastites and the Zorrillists could not pull together, Malcampo retained office in it as Minister of Marine. The Finance Minister, Señor Angulo, also retained his office; and this was the more regretted by the outside world because he had lately brought forward a disreputable scheme for replenishing the Treasury by imposing a tax of 18 per cent. on the coupons of the Foreign Debt. The fall of the Malcampo Cabinet had been preceded by a very animated debate on the subject of the International Association. The Ministry declared the Association to be outside the Constitution, and within the Penal Code. The Opposition, on the other hand, denounced the restrictive policy in matters of meeting and combining, which the Government seemed desirous to adopt. Many Members, however, abstained from voting; and the Government gained a majority by 192 to 38. On the 18th, the King declared the Sessions of the Cortes suspended.

We conclude our account of Spanish affairs for this year with a reference to a tragic event which occurred in the island of Cuba. The rebellion in that dependency of Spain, which had begun in 1868, still continued. The constant drain of men and money from the mother country required to hold it in check, was one great cause of the financial embarrassments from which it seemed hopeless for her to emerge. A jealous notion of honour stood in the way of giving any encouragement to the Government of the United States in its desire to purchase the island of the Spanish Crown. "Cuba must not be lost" was the cry of each successive Ministry, more perhaps from fear of damaging their reputation at home than from real patriotic conviction. The Cuban insurgents commanded the support of a party of "sympathizers" on the American mainland, and were thus enabled to hold on more effectually than perhaps they would otherwise have done. Against them a force of Volunteers maintained a sort of "Reign of Terror," which Government was powerless to restrain. On the night of the 25th of November some young medical students at Havannah were arrested on a charge of having desecrated the tombs of Señor Castañón and another Cuban, regarded as martyrs to the cause of Spanish loyalty. Little or no evidence was given of the acts of desecration, or that the frolic of the young men had any sort of political meaning. But the Volunteer force was master of the day, and coerced the civil authorities; and the end of the matter was, that eight lads belonging to the best families in Havannah were led out after only two hours' warning, and shot before the prison-walls in the Campo del Punto. Sentences of imprisonment and transportation were inflicted on a great many besides.

PORTUGAL.

In Portuguese affairs we have little to chronicle. There were two ministerial crises ; one in February, when the Marquis D'Avila reconstructed the Cabinet on the resignation of two of the Ministers ; and another in September, when D'Avila himself resigned, and Señor Fontes became the President of a new Cabinet.

The Emperor of Brazil visited Lisbon in May, and was received by his kinsman of Portugal with cordial hospitality. A rebellion took place in the little dependency of Goa in the East Indies, which was suppressed before the end of the year.

BELGIUM.

The Peace Conferences between France and Germany were held at Brussels in March and April.

In this little kingdom, as elsewhere, the two extreme world-influences were at work. Ultramontane agitators were busy with the endeavour to procure an interposition of Government in favour of the Pope. On the other hand, the circumstances attending several workmen's strikes which took place at Ghent, Brussels, and elsewhere, showed that the dreaded "International" had its adherents among the industrial classes of society.

The most important incident of the year was the anti-ministerialist demonstration in December. Baron d'Anethan, who had been raised to the Premiership by the victory of the Clerical and Conservative party in the summer of 1870, had steered his course prudently during the war, and in domestic politics he had increased the power of the Ultramontanes considerably by carrying a Reform Bill, which widened the basis of representation by introducing large masses of the Catholic lower orders to the privilege of the franchise. As the Protestants of the whole country only number about 10,000 as against 5,000,000 Romanists, the democratic move was evidently calculated to throw increased power into the hands of the priests. This, at all events, was the case in the country districts. In the towns there was a much stronger Liberal element at work. The law was not to be put in operation till the spring of 1872. Meantime the Liberals waited for an opportunity to show their discontent, and they found one towards the end of the year, when Government appointed to the office of Governor of Limburg M. de Decker, one of the most conspicuous leaders of the Clerical party. It was not, however, on political, but on personal and moral grounds, that the nomination of M. de Decker was attacked. He was denounced as one of the Directors of the banking-house Langrand-Demonceau, some of whose transactions happened to be under judicial investigation. M. Bara led the attack of the Opposition in the Chamber. M. Nothomb defended the Government. The Clerical party outvoted the Liberals,

but the mob of Brussels took up the question, and tumults came to pass which the police and civic guard had to put down by force. M. de Decker resigned the office to which he had been appointed. His resignation, however, did not appease the populace; it was demanded that the Ministers themselves, who had ventured to nominate him, should retire. The King at first demurred, but he resolved that, at all events, his new advisers should be chosen out of the Parliamentary majority, which had given its support to the outgoing statesmen. Accordingly, M. de Theux, a Member of the Right, like D'Anethan, succeeded to the office of Prime Minister. On the 12th De Theux made a ministerial communication to the Chamber of Representatives, when he had to encounter the opposition of the Bara party. M. Bara reproached the new Ministers on their presenting themselves as a simple Ministry of Affairs, while their political past designated them clearly as a Ministry of clerical reaction. M. Malou, the Minister of Finance, argued the constitutional question in the abstract, and refused all responsibility for what had happened during the crisis, except only for the constitution of the new Cabinet. The *émeutes*, he said, had compromised the respectability of Belgium, and the mission of the new Cabinet must now be one of restoring peace. M. Frère-Orban, the chief of the Ministry which had preceded that of Baron d'Anethan, attacked the new Ministers violently for shelving the question of responsibility for the dismissal of the late Cabinet. He maintained that they would have been in a better position if they had allowed the Opposition to undertake the Government, and had consented to a dissolution of the Chambers. The acts of the Ministers had caused the *émeutes*; a free and manly nation could not be ruled like a convent or a barrack. He concluded by giving it as his personal opinion that the late Ministers had been dismissed by the King because of their unworthiness; an assertion to which M. Jacobs, late Minister of Finance, replied by a *tu quoque*. Unfortunately, the speakers continually dragged the King's name into the discussion.

NETHERLANDS.

A new Cabinet, with M. Thorbecke at its head, took office at the commencement of the year. In December a Treaty was introduced into the Houses of Legislature for the cession to England of the Dutch possessions on the coast of Guinea, for which a convention between the two countries had been signed in February.

A new Customs' Bill for the Dutch East India possessions abolished the last remains of the Indian Protective tariff.

SWITZERLAND.

The Peace Society held its meeting at Lausanne in September, when Herr Sonnemann, the Frankfort Member of the German

Parliament brought a friendly greeting from the Democrats of his country, who, he stated, were opposed to the annexation of Alsace and Lorraine. He deplored the increasing lack of public spirit at home, and expressed a conviction that France and Germany would hereafter extend hands to each other, notwithstanding the Bonapartes and Bismarcks. The applause with which these sentiments were received by the meeting was but feeble. M. Fribourg defended the International, and demanded that the League should contest the proposed new law with reference to the Association. Several stormy debates took place on the subject of the Paris Commune. Finally, amidst great uproar, a resolution was passed condemnatory of the massacres perpetrated under its rule.

The Infallibility question had its echoes among the Catholic Cantons. At a meeting of "Old Catholics" at Solothurn in September it was proposed by Alt-Landamman Kurti, of St. Gallen, "that they should once for all secede from the Church of Rome." The speech in which he explained and supported this proposition was one long act of accusation against the Papacy, and was very frequently interrupted by applause. When put to the vote, however, it was strongly opposed by many speakers and utterly lost. The main points urged against it were these:—By his protest against the resolutions of the last Vatican Council each protester had declared that he did not recognize a Church with an infallible Pope at its head to be the Catholic Church. But for this very reason there could be no question of secession from the Catholic Church, since it was precisely the antagonists of the Syllabus and the Papal Infallibility who were the true representatives of the Catholic principle, and who, from so being, called themselves "Old Catholics:" nothing would be more welcome and pleasing to the upholders of Infallibility than the secession of their adversaries from the Catholic Church.

Lucerne, the head-quarters of the old Roman Catholic *Sonderbund*, was still the stronghold of the Swiss Ultramontanists. The Papal Nuncio had his residence there; and he spared no effort to lead the Central Government into a reactionary policy, insisting above all things on the restoration of the religious houses which had been suppressed during the late ascendancy of the Liberal party. But while some anxiety was felt as to what the result of his manœuvres might be, the very existence of cantonal rights in their hitherto constitutional acceptance was becoming a matter of serious doubt and discussion. For many years past schemes for a reform of the Federal Constitution had been afloat. In the winter of 1870-71 a Committee was appointed to draw up a list of proposed amendments, and in the session of the two Chambers which commenced on the 6th of November this year the whole subject was taken into serious consideration. The Committee had been instructed that the Federal principle on which the Constitution was based should remain untouched. This understanding, however, was not adhered to, and a party of "unionists," composed chiefly of members of the

democratic party, formed itself, which advocated centralizing the State as much as possible and introducing a uniform system in respect of law, of military service, and of education. This party was very strong in the National Council, which is composed of deputies, elected according to population; but in the State Council, to which each canton elects two Members, without reference to population, the number of "unionists" was comparatively small. The reforms which were brought forward for discussion aimed at carrying out this transfer of power from the cantons to the nation at large, and so throwing political action more directly into the hands of the people. As the constitutional question is still under discussion, its exposition properly belongs to the history of the coming year. We may content ourselves here with mentioning one measure relative to the ever-vexing question of Church and State, which received the sanction of the National Council (*Bundesrath*) in December. It was to prohibit the Jesuits from settling in Switzerland, or from making any attempts at education, or from founding or re-establishing convents throughout the Federal territories.

SWEDEN.

The death of the Queen, Wilhelmina of Orange, and the dangerous illness of the King, in the months of February and March, are among the few public events which attract notice in the history of the Northern monarchies this year. The question of military reform occupied a great deal of attention in the Swedish Diet. In the early session a Bill was brought in based upon a former one of 1869, in which the principle of general liability to military service was announced, as well as a tax for the purchase of war material and the erection of fortresses. When the Diet closed, on the 20th of May, the King had to express his regret that the measure had not been carried, but he announced that a special session would be held in the autumn for the purpose of again considering it. The Diet accordingly reassembled in September. Again the opponents of the Government measure proved victorious; and in consequence of its rejection by the Second Chamber, the Ministers tendered their resignation. In the King's speech of May the 20th, allusion was made to the recent rejection, by the Norwegian *Storting*, of the scheme for a union of Norway and Sweden, and it was announced that this question would in consequence be postponed until facilities should present themselves for a natural development of the connexion between two countries so closely related. In the Budget presented to the Diet in January the revenue for the financial year 1871-1872 was estimated at 45,610,000 rigsdaler, and the expenditure at 50,563,000 rigsdaler, exclusive of 17,000,000 rigsdaler for extraordinary military expenses.

A project of the Swedish Government to annex the sterile island of Spitzbergen, "for scientific purposes," was officially opposed by

the Cabinet of St. Petersburg, on the ground that public opinion in Russia, though not adverse to the existence of Swedish colonies on the island, was against any formal annexation. Granting, it was urged, that Spitzbergen, being a country which is useless for agricultural purposes, has at present no value for Russia, it might yet become more fertile at some future period, as the Gulf Stream which proceeds from America along the Norwegian coast is beginning to take another direction. The project was abandoned accordingly.

DENMARK.

In September King Christian, travelling *incognito*, arrived at Baden, and visited the Emperor of Germany. A marriage was arranged to take place between the King's daughter, Princess Thyra, and the King of Bavaria. The Budget for the financial year 1872-3 was declared in October. It showed a deficiency of about two million dollars, which it was proposed to cover by an income tax of three-and-a-half per cent. for three years.

RUSSIA.

"We have thus arrived at the end of the glorious and bloody war which has been forced upon us by the frivolity of the French. Prussia will never forget that she owes it to you that the war did not enter upon extreme dimensions. May God bless you for it! Yours till death,

WILLIAM."

"Many thanks for the communication of the Preliminaries of Peace. I share your joy. May it be the will of God that a durable peace follows. I am happy that I could prove to you my sympathy as a devoted friend. May the friendship which unites us insure the happiness and the glory of both countries.

ALEXANDER."

Such were the telegrams which flashed between Versailles and St. Petersburg, on the 27th of February, the day on which the capitulation of Paris had been decided. The outside world stood for a moment dismayed. So cordial an understanding between the rulers of Teutonic Germany and Slavonic Russia had not been anticipated. In fact, the "National party" in Russia itself had throughout the war looked suspiciously upon the German successes. The publication of the above telegrams by the advice of the party inclined towards Germany was purposely intended to reassure those otherwise minded, as showing that the Czar had been able to exercise an influence of his own on the course of events.

In Russia, as in most other countries of Europe this year, much attention was paid to the subject of army organization. The Prussian successes had frightened all old military systems out of their self-complacency, and the great War-office question of the day was whether the Prussian plan of universal liability to service

should be established or not, the alternative in despotic monarchies being conscription. The general-liability principle was decided upon by the Government of the Czar, and committees were appointed to reconstruct the army accordingly. The measures decided upon were the following:—The period of service to commence, as a rule, at the age of twenty-one, and to last fifteen years. The pupils of the middle schools, however, only to be drafted into the army at the age of twenty-two, and the students of the higher schools and universities allowed to postpone their service until the age of twenty-seven. The period of active service to vary according to the degree of education. Those who have passed through the university course to serve continuously in the army for six months only; those who have completed their studies at a gymnasium or a lyceum, for a year; and so on, down to those who can neither read nor write, and who will have to give six years' active service. Large classes of persons were held to be exempted from service; among them, only sons, artisans (under certain conditions), clergymen of all creeds, teachers, physicians, &c. There might be other causes of exemption, as domestic circumstances, pecuniary means, educational considerations, and so forth. Notwithstanding these exemptions, it was calculated that the army would consist, in time of war, of 1,653,393 men and 50,954 officers of all ranks. Of these, 32,817 officers and 1,332,543 soldiers would be stationed in European Russia, and 4071 officers and 163,211 soldiers in the Caucasus. There would be in all 1293 battalions of infantry, 280 squadrons of cavalry, and 2574 guns. In time of peace the number of troops under arms would be 34,707 officers and 730,000 soldiers (exclusive of 37,000 men for local depôts), and the number of troops who could at once be mobilized in case of a war would be 1,234,460.

The Conference held in London to reconsider the Treaty of 1856 decided to abrogate the clauses respecting the neutralization of the Black Sea; and the preliminary declaration made in consequence of the abrupt announcement of Prince Gortschakoff in the preceding autumn, to the effect that no Power had a right to liberate itself at pleasure from Treaty engagements, was very little to set against the tangible advantages which resulted to Russia from the change.

In the month of July an important trial took place at St. Petersburg, connected with a sect which professed revolutionary tenets beyond the extreme of International Association doctrines. The "Nihilists," as they called themselves, were an offshoot of Russian extravagance on the Socialist stock. Their agitation began with some students' riots in the spring of 1869, its chief promoters being three men named Netchajeff, Orloff, and Ikatscheff. In the autumn of that year a secret society was formed at Moscow with branches in various other towns. This society was well provided with funds; it had a special seal and cipher of its own, and any breach of its regulations was punished with death. Every new member of the

society, after swearing to observe its regulations, was attached to a "circle" of five persons, who acted together, but were kept entirely ignorant of the constitution of the other circles. The "circles" were placed under the orders of a "section;" but the section, when communicating with a circle, never mentioned its members by name; each of them was distinguished in the society by a number only. At the head of the society was a committee which exercised judicial functions, and whose members, like those of the "section" and the "circles," were unknown to the other conspirators. The means by which the object of the society was to be attained were at first much discussed. Some proposed that the overthrow of the Government should be brought about by a gradual propagation of socialist ideas among the masses; others, among whom was Netchajeff, that steps should at once be taken for producing a popular insurrection. Ultimately it was decided to adopt Netchajeff's proposal. A series of inflammatory proclamations were accordingly circulated among the people; and it would seem, in the words of the act of accusation against them, that the object of the new conspirators was "to bring about a popular insurrection by a series of assassinations in the highest spheres of the Government, which would create such confusion as to enable them to work on the masses by false reports and misrepresentations of the acts of the authorities, and lead ultimately to that general disorganization of society at which they aimed."

The opinions of the "Nihilists," as set forth in a "programme," seemed to consist simply in regarding with dissatisfaction, doubt, protest, and meditated rebellion every established ordinance. The "Nihilist" was a moral Berserker; he was positively absorbed in the one idea and passion of Revolution: for this he was prepared to sacrifice every thing. The present prosecution resulted in the condemnation of eleven of the sect to different degrees of punishment.

In the early part of the summer Cardinal Antonelli made overtures for a reconciliation between Russia and the Holy See, based on certain mutual concessions. Russia, it would seem, was asked to abolish the Synod appointed by the Government to administer the affairs of the Roman Catholic Church in the Empire, and to permit the publication of the doctrine of Papal infallibility, in return for which the Pope would be prepared not only to confirm all the appointments lately made by the Russian Government to bishoprics, but also to exercise his influence to induce the Polish clergy and laity "conscientiously to fulfil their duties to the Emperor as his subjects." It was decided, however, by the Russian Government to maintain "an attitude of expectation" with regard to the Holy See until the opposition to the Papal pretensions which had manifested itself in Germany, Hungary, and other countries should more fully develop itself.

Later in the year we have notice of a sentiment tending towards union between the German "Old Catholics," or Dollinger party, and the Russian Church. The matter was discussed in various journals, and differing conclusions as to its practicability were arrived at.

The cholera burst out with some severity at St. Petersburg this summer.

As the year began, so it closed, with a movement of fraternization towards the new German Empire. The Czar sent an invitation to the German Knights of St. George to celebrate at his capital the day of their patron Saint. They came, an illustrious band, the heroes of the late war: Prince Frederick Charles, Prince Augustus of Württemberg, Prince Hohenlohe-Tafelfingen, General Alvensleben, General Werder, General Badritzky; and last, not least, the great Von Moltke, Field-Marshal and Count. It was during the progress of the contest that Alexander of Russia had bestowed on these warriors the highest military Order of his Empire. It was a sign of his good will, then, when the world stood dubious of the temper of the neutral Powers; and now that peace had returned, this festival reunion at St. Petersburg seemed to betoken that he was as far as ever from giving real encouragement to the prospects recently vaunted by sanguine French politicians, of a Franco-Russian alliance which was one day to wreak signal retribution on the ambitious House of Hohenzollern. And yet there was even now an undercurrent of national impulses at work, from which close observers augured that Russia might before long have to take up a distinct and rival, if not an antagonist, position to that occupied by the representatives of German unity. The Slavonic populations, whose struggles in Austria this year had almost rent the walls of the Constitution in that heterogenous Empire, and whose discontent within the borders of Germany had been one of the many difficulties in Bismarck's path, showed signs of an attraction of sympathy towards the one great European Power with which they were allied by race; and Pan-Slavism, under the headship of Russia, became a favourite cry with revolutionary spirits. Much was said of the new intimate relations growing up between the Czar and Prince Milan of Serbia, in connexion with the idea of a new South Slavonic Empire which was to have its seat at Belgrade. Even the*anti-pathies of the Poles towards their Russian masters seemed inclined to efface themselves in hopes of a Pan-Slavonic regeneration. A remarkable article in the *St. Petersburg Gazette*, a semi-official organ which appeared about Christmas, gave recognition to these anticipations, while it deprecated any eager pressure for their fulfilment. The article gives a very interesting exposition of the political situation in Russia at the present moment, and we will proceed to extract some of the passages in it which bear on the Pan-Slavonic question.

"We cannot deny that there is something in the opinion of those who, looking at the recent innovation in Austria, contend that we cannot allow a system to be established on our very frontiers which aims at strengthening our principal enemies and at weakening our natural allies. The changes which are being made in Austria concern us not only as neighbours, but also as co-nationalists of the numerous Slavonian tribes, whose fate is greatly imperilled by recent

events. Without wishing to exaggerate possible dangers, we yet cannot help saying that if the Austrian crisis were to assume an aspect prejudicial to ourselves, the simplest means of averting evil would be to acknowledge the peril and act calmly and resolutely. We, of course, have no wish to unite the various Slavonian tribes under Russian hegemony. On the contrary, we combat this idea and hold that those advocating it will only arouse national sensibilities and create difficulties which it is not our interest to nourish nor the interest of the Slavonians either. The enthusiasts recommending this grand design are in the habit of telling us that we should imitate the example of German unity, and that we have an equal right with our Western neighbours to form our co-nationalists into a compact whole. They forget that German unity is the result of the history of a thousand years, that it was preceded by an uncommonly high degree of civilization, and that the people who succeeded in establishing it had long before attained military, financial, and political power of no ordinary extent. They likewise lose sight of the fact that, notwithstanding all these advantages, the Germans had to carry on a prolonged national movement, and to go through a war which, but for the egregious mistakes of the Napoleonic policy, might have had a less favourable result. And after all this, unity, in the sense in which the term is most frequently used, has not yet been fully secured. It is even doubtful whether what has been established after so many years of toil will outlast the present enthusiastic period. Are there no separatistic elements in Germany endeavouring to modify or break up unity?

"The Slavonian tribes are differently situated; their history, being of more recent date, has not yet been developed to the same degree of maturity. Still their destinies are being gradually worked out. To accelerate the process would be to court the fatalities of chance. There is no need to do this, considering that the national existence of the Slavonian world is no longer a subject of doubt. Henceforth no human power can succeed in erasing this grand fact from history. Already Austria endeavours to conciliate the Slavonian inhabitants of her provinces, and is intent upon changes which may ultimately produce fresh elements of culture, progress, and power. The process is certainly fraught with difficulties, and the first experiments have been frustrated by the agency of antagonistic elements. But there is no cause to despair. Similar exertions are being made in Turkey, where Islamism, relying upon the population of Asia Minor, offers even a greater obstacle. . . . If this is so, is it our interest, or the interest of the Slavonian tribes, to interrupt this continuous process, and interfere with the labour of a whole race, who are toiling to call into existence a new national element? The work may be slow and obstructed at every turn, but it is, nevertheless, steadily progressing. To precipitate an historical evolution of this magnitude would be to diminish its vitality, and, perhaps, bring it to a complete standstill.

"By becoming what she is, Russia has conferred an immense

service upon all nations of Slavonic descent. A great military Power, with a language, civilization, and literature of her own, she has developed a national type which is a powerful help to the scattered members of the Slavonic family, oppressed by the strong arm or devoured by the superior civilization of foreigners. To continue her course of domestic invigoration, and abide by her pacific policy, is the greatest boon Russia can confer upon the Slavonians. Russia would injure herself as well as the Slavonians were she, while un-attacked, to exhaust her resources in a struggle, the more dangerous for being premature. . . . The greatest enemy of the Slavonians is that imprudent Panslavism which prevents their being accorded those political rights so necessary to reach national autonomy. No Government will submit to a portion of their subjects systematically opposing them and obeying inspirations coming from abroad. . . . The distribution of the various tribes among the historical monarchies of Europe is, moreover, a law of Providence destined to promote progress. Portions of the same nationality being assigned to different States, peace receives an additional guarantee. In the olden times, when national and linguistic frontiers coincided, wars were more frequent and terrible; and, in the conflict we have just witnessed, had all Latin races stood on one side, and all Teutonic on the other, the collision would have been infinitely more fearful than it was. We are indebted to the historical and geographical divisions which have in course of time supervened between men of the same race that these gigantic struggles between nation and nation are no longer possible.

"Peace being a general necessity, we may hope that it will be preserved. France needs it to recover her strength. Germany is anxious to consolidate unity, and has no wish to endanger the precious fruits of victory by too much enterprise. Austria has no more immediate interest than to set her house in order. Russia prizes peace as the one thing needful to secure her advancement in wealth, culture, and reform. Unwilling to attack, she is too strong to dread being attacked. It would be well if the motives animating the pacific action of the Powers were duly appreciated by the Press, and employed as a means of allaying susceptibilities and dispelling prejudice. Let us hope that the really well intentioned among journalists will imitate the example set them by the various Governments."

TURKEY.

In consequence of the revision of the Black Sea Treaty at the Conference of London, the Porte made a new set of regulations relative to the passage of the Straits of the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus by merchant-vessels. Hitherto ships going to the Mediterranean had been obliged to stop at the Castles of the Dardanelles and lower a boat in order to land their firman. This measure exposed them to great inconvenience, and also to some danger, on account of the

strong currents running down, and the narrowness of that part of the channel. It was now resolved to station a man-of-war opposite Gallipoli, at a point of easy access for ships, and to receive the firmans on board of it. With regard to vessels going to the Black Sea, it was arranged that two steam launches should be in attendance a little beyond Buyukdereh Bay, which should board every ship passing, and receive the firman. Finally, in order to relieve ships coming from the Black Sea and bound to the Mediterranean from the present obligation of stopping at Constantinople to get their firman for the Dardanelles, every vessel leaving the Golden Horn for the Black Sea was to be at liberty to take a double firman, viz. one for the Bosphorus and the other for the Hellespont.

We notice in connexion with the Black Sea Treaty a certain change in the spirit of Turkish policy. In the semi-official organ, the *Turquie* of Constantinople, it was said that Turkey had made friends with her traditional enemy Russia, though she had done this "far more because she fears a conflict in which she would be without effective allies than because she trusts in the friendly intentions of the Russian Government." It was added that the same conviction of the impossibility of maintaining herself unaided in Europe had prompted her to take up "the idea of Islamite unity and of the restoration of the old Caliphate in Asia and Africa."

The death of the Grand Vizier Ali Pasha in the summer was followed by a period of ministerial confusion. Mahmoud Pasha became Grand Vizier, but Ahmed Vefik Effendi attained to the highest place in the Sultan's confidence.

The cholera visited Constantinople in the autumn, and was somewhat severe in one of the quarters of Pera, around which a sanitary *cordon* was drawn.

Roumania.—So adverse were the prospects of the Roumanian Government in face of the "Red" party at Bucharest in the beginning of this year, that Prince Charles expressed in a letter his intention of retiring from the sovereignty. The German and Austrian Chancellors, however, united in dissuading him, and in his own dominions so strong a reaction set in in his favour, that when the Prince opened the Chambers on the 4th of June he was received with enthusiasm. Subsequently his Government fell into deep disgrace with Bismarck, in consequence of its repudiation of the railway obligations, contracted chiefly with German bondholders. Bismarck complained to the Porte, and the Porte exercised its right of sovereignty by admonishing Prince Charles, himself the sport of his wayward majorities. The Prince likewise received letters of advice on the subject from England, Austria, Russia, and France. Finally, a convention acknowledging the Roumanian obligations was agreed to by the Government and passed the Lower Chamber of the Assembly at the turn of the year.

GREECE.

For our notice of Greece this year we may content ourselves with extracting a few sentences from a letter of the Athens Correspondent of the *Times*, dated Nov. 11 :—

“King George opened the present session of the Chamber on the 30th of October with a speech from the throne, in which a very favourable view was given of the internal condition and finances of the country, and several important legislative measures were announced, including the abolition of the system of taxing the cultivation of cereals by levying a tenth of the gross produce of the land, and, what is even more injurious to the cultivator, interfering with the operations of agriculture as soon as the grain ripens. . . . M. Soteropoulos, the Minister of Finance, who retires from office, deserves the highest praise for recommending this measure. Had the tenth been abolished when Greece became a constitutional monarchy in 1844, the agriculture of the kingdom would be now in a different condition from the utterly barbarous state in which it remains. But in spite of this tardy act of wisdom, and all the other promises of Koumoundouros, the days of his Ministry were numbered.

“On the 6th inst. M. Chatsiskos was elected President of the Chamber by a large majority, receiving 78 votes, while the Ministerial candidate received only 48. Koumoundouros immediately resigned, and Zaimes, the leader of the Opposition, formed a new Ministry, taking to himself the Departments of the Interior and of Foreign Affairs.”

CHAPTER VI.

AMERICA.—UNITED STATES—St. Domingo Annexation Project—Relations with Great Britain—Mr. Motley's Recall—Reception of the Fenian Refugees—Joint High Commission—New Congress—Ejection of Mr. Sumner from Committee on Foreign Relations—Treaty of Washington—Sumner's Speech on the Treaty—Departure of British Commissioners—Census Returns—Mr. Wells on the Condition of Trade—Ku-Klux bands—“New Departure”—Orange Riot at New York—Erie Ring and Tammany Ring—Proceedings against the Mormons—Fire at Chicago—Expedition against Corea—Negotiations with Red Indians—President's Message—Financial Report—Meeting of the “International.”

BRAZIL—King Pedro II.—Emancipation Act.

ARGENTINE REPUBLIC.—Plague at Buenos Ayres.

ASIA.—Cholera in Arabia—Floods in China—Famine in Persia.

AMERICA.—UNITED STATES.

The Congress of the United States assembled on the 4th of January. Its attention was immediately occupied with the ques-

tion of the annexation of St. Domingo, which the President had dwelt upon in his Message at the close of 1870, and as to which his desires had been pertinaciously crossed by Mr. Sumner in the Senate. General Grant now succeeded in inducing Congress to pass a resolution ordering that a Commission of Inquiry should be sent to the island; but with the proviso, that the legislative body did not thereby commit itself to the act of annexation. The members of the Commission, however, were supposed to be all favourable to the scheme. They started on their expedition in the middle of January. Meanwhile, as this favourite project could by no means be brought to the stage of treaty during the actual session of Congress, the President turned his attention to another matter of much larger importance, to which also his recent Message had drawn attention, and the settlement of which had been the talk and the failure of British and American Statesmen ever since the year 1863.

Certain passages in the President's Message, coupled with the abrupt recall of Mr. Motley, the United States Minister in England, had aroused fears in the minds of some who earnestly desired the maintenance of pacific relations between the Old and the New country, that General Grant had resolved on presenting a categorical demand to the British Government, which, if not complied with, would at once be followed by the outbreak of hostilities. The successive refusals of several statesmen to take the post vacated by Mr. Motley were regarded as signs of their disinclination to back up Grant's warlike policy; and when General Schenck, a distinguished commander, finally accepted the mission to England, it was imagined, by the majority of Englishmen at all events, that military habits and prepossessions were likely to impart a peremptory aspect to the negotiations. When, however, on a requisition from the Senate at Washington, the documents relative to Mr. Motley's recall were brought to view, it appeared that it was because that Minister had too much identified himself with the policy of Sumner, not because he was too yielding to the claims of England, that the President had objected to his agency. Motley's protest on the occasion led to a reply from Mr. Hamilton Fish, the Secretary of State, which had a reassuring effect upon the British public. Mr. Fish said it was expected that Mr. Motley would have represented the views of his Government, but that before he left America "it became apparent that upon a question of controlling interest at that moment occupying the attention of the thoughtful and the prudent to restrain the passions which had been excited by eloquent declamation and powerful rhetoric, Mr. Motley accepted the views upon which popular excitement had been stimulated and wrought to the verge of dangerous irritation, rather than those which the President deemed to be sound and based upon the true principles of public law." Mr. Motley had prepared a memoir on the "Alabama" claims, which he submitted to Mr. Fish. The Secretary of State said that he had rejected this memoir, as

"it was written with a full impression of the views presented in a then recent debate in the Senate ("on the Johnson-Clarendon treaty"), and abounded in forcible expressions, and strong epithets, and terms of denunciation, not appropriate to the calm discussion of a grave international difference, and little calculated to allay existing excitement or irritation, or to induce her Majesty's Government to lend a patient ear to the presentation of the American case." Mr. Motley was furnished then with instructions, the tone, temper, and language of which were conciliatory. Mr. Fish continued, "The positive instructions to Mr. Motley as to what he must say were limited to two points:—First, he was directed to say to Lord Clarendon that his Government, in rejecting the recent Convention, abandoned neither its own claims nor those of its citizens, nor the hope of an easy, satisfactory, and friendly settlement of the questions pending between the two Governments. Second, he was further instructed that in his private and social intercourse, as well as in his official conversations, when it should become necessary he should place the cause of grievance of the United States against Great Britain not so much upon her issuance of the recognition of the insurgents' state of war as upon her conduct under and subsequent to such recognition. The President held, in accordance with the doctrine of the best writers upon international law, and with the precedents of our own history, and as a logical result from the fact of national sovereignty, that it is the right of every Power, when a civil conflict has arisen within another State, and has attained a sufficient complexity, magnitude, and completeness, to defend its own relations and those of its citizens and subjects towards the parties to the conflict, so far as their rights and interests are necessarily affected by it. Mr. Motley was instructed that such were the President's views, which he was to present, and that while the President regarded the necessity and propriety of the original concession of belligerency by Great Britain as 'questionable,' he regarded that concession as part of the case only so far as it shows the beginning and the *animus* of that course of conduct which resulted so disastrously to the United States. That it was not to be treated as the gravamen of the complaint, the instructions made more clear by their reference to the fact that there were other Powers that were contemporaneous with Great Britain who made similar concessions; but that in England only had the concessions been followed by acts resulting in direct damage to the United States." Mr. Fish went on to point out that in the teeth of these instructions Mr. Motley had used the language of his rejected "memoir." He had talked "of the gravity of the occasion," of the "burning questions of grievance." More than once he was said to have gone to the very verge of admissible diplomatic suggestion in alluding, without any authority for so doing, to the contingencies which would depend on negotiations concerning such vital questions.

A statement like this, coming from an official source, might well seem to bode a pacific future. Yet party exigencies, and

the "bid" for the Irish vote, presented a somewhat startling contradiction when on the 30th of January, the House of Representatives, by the immense majority of 172 to 21 votes, carried a resolution introduced by General Butler, welcoming the Fenian refugees from Ireland, O'Donovan Rossa and his companions, who had just landed in America after their release from prison. English susceptibilities took fright anew, and it was expected that this step would be followed by other manifestations of sympathy with the cause of Irish sedition. But the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate took no action upon the vote, and the Fenian heroes, after receiving a street ovation from their compatriots at New York, and being fêted and funded by the members of the "Erie Ring" and Tammany Hall, dropped into obscurity in that not very respectably-governed city.

The appointment of a Joint High Commission for the settlement of all disputed points between the United States and British North America, notably of the fisheries question, which had risen into troublesome proportions in the preceding year, came as a first suggestion from the British Government. The President of the United States, in signifying his assent, proposed that the same Commission should comprise within its sphere of consideration the long outstanding subject of the "Alabama" claims, together with all other matters of dispute between the American Government and that of Great Britain. In view of these new arrangements, General Schenck's often deferred voyage to England was again postponed.

On February the 27th, the Commissioners of the two governments met at Washington; and five days afterwards they held their first full meeting. The Commissioners on the side of England were Lord De Grey, Sir Edward Thornton (British Minister in America), Sir Stafford Northcote, Professor Bernard, and Sir John Macdonald of Canada. On the side of America were General Schenck, Mr. Hamilton Fish (the Secretary for Foreign Affairs), Mr. Ebenezer Hoar, Mr. George H. Williams, and Mr. Justice Nelson. The subject-matter of the treaty has already been recorded under the head of English affairs.

On the 4th of March, the same day that the Joint High Commission began business, the Congress finished its natural term of existence, and a new Congress—the forty-second of American history—came into office, the American Constitution allowing no interval to elapse between the expiry and birth of its successive legislatures—"Le roi est mort; Vive le roi." The party forces in the new Congress were thus estimated at the outset:—In the Senate, 57 Republicans, 15 Democrats, 2 vacant seats; in the House of Representatives, 131 Republicans, 96 Democrats, 16 vacant seats: showing, in that body, a reduction of the Republican majority to below two-thirds. As usual, the veteran Sumner stood foremost among the Republicans in the Senate, and maintained the post which he had held ever since 1861, of Head of the Committee on Foreign Relations. As usual, too, he represented

the extreme of anti-British feeling on the subject of the "Alabama claims," and was looked upon as the chief stumbling-block in the way of the pacific policy which Grant seemed now bent on pursuing through the medium of the Joint Commission. He was also the chief obstructor of the President's policy regarding St. Domingo. Now Grant was set upon carrying out his own views in these two directions; some said it was because he was desirous, in view of the not distant Presidential election, to have some measure of substantial success to record for his expired term of office. In any case, the removal of Sumner from his vantage-ground of obstruction could not fail to be a great gain to him.

At the opening of each yearly session of the Senate, it is customary at Washington to hold a "caucus," to revise the Committees and fill up vacancies. This is usually a matter of form as regards existing members, the right of displacement being but rarely exercised. Sumner's long tenure of his place, however, proved now no bar to the efforts which the President's friends made to oust him. An adverse vote was recorded against the old senator; and the fiat of the "caucus" was ratified by an obedient majority in the Senate itself, thirty-three against nine; most of Sumner's friends declining to vote. Mr. Cameron succeeded to his post.

The removal of Sumner from the chairmanship of the Committee on Foreign Relations caused a profound political sensation in the States. To the President the victory was an important one, but it contained germs of uneasiness. It revealed the insidious power of the "caucus" system, which could over-ride the wishes of legislative assemblies, and it arrayed against him, on the still contestable ground of the St. Domingo question, the defeated opposition, consisting of Sumner's friends and the Democrats in combination. In fact after a very bitter speech on the question from Sumner on the 27th of March, the Presidential party took alarm, and Grant thought it his best policy to relinquish his pet scheme. When therefore the Commissioners, having returned from St. Domingo, presented their report, he took the "back track," to use an American phrase, and threw the matter over to Congress, requesting that no decision should be made before the winter.

On the 19th Senator Sumner made a long speech upon the subject of the Washington Treaty. He announced that he approached its consideration with perfect fairness, and had no prejudices or preconceived opinions against it. No Senator, he said, was more anxious than he was that all differences existing between the Governments of the United States and Great Britain should be removed. But at the same time he was in favour of maintaining the national honour, and desired that respect for the American flag abroad which could only result from respect for it at home. In many points this Treaty differed from all the Treaties negotiated by the United States' Government from its foundation. It was not a Treaty of Peace—that is, of a peace following a war between two nations—and yet to some extent it was a Treaty of Peace. Upon its ratification or rejection in great measure depended the

character of the relations which in future would exist between the two Governments, and for this reason, if for no other, it ought to receive the most careful consideration of the Senate. It was not such a document as he desired, yet he was not disappointed in it. From the very nature of the Commission that framed the Treaty he knew its labours must result in a compromise. The only question was whether the advantage of the bargain was with or against the United States. Senators would have to judge of this for themselves. Much had been said about the so-called apology in the Treaty coming from the British side. He did not regard the language used as conveying any apology. Her Majesty's Government simply expressed regret for the escape of the Alabama and other vessels from British ports and for the depredations committed by those vessels. There was something behind and beyond this. Every one knew that the Alabama and other rebel cruisers were but the consequences of Great Britain's conduct in recognizing the rebels as belligerents. If there was any apology to be made it should be made for this flagrant disregard of the law of nations. Mr. Sumner argued at length that the great wrong done the United States was in the recognition by Great Britain of the rebels as belligerents before they had formed a Government or had possession of a single port. He did not think the American Commissioners should have consented to allow the English counter-claims to be put upon the same footing as those of citizens of the United States. They were of a different character, and did not originate under the same circumstances. They were the result of Great Britain's own misconduct. The attitude she assumed towards the rebels, as every body knew, prolonged the rebellion at least two years. If the property of her citizens suffered in consequence, nobody was to blame but herself. Hence these claims should not have been admitted. Mr. Sumner reiterated the whole arguments against the Johnson-Clarendon Treaty; but he abstained from explicitly saying whether he would vote for or against ratification.

When the debate came on in the Senate, from the 22nd to the 24th of May, he proposed three amendments; in accordance with his views on the question of neutrality, of belligerent rights, and of the British counter-claims; but these being defeated, he acquiesced, and the "Treaty of Washington" was accepted by the Senate without any alteration, by a majority of fifty to twelve.

On that same day the British Commissioners re-embarked for England, General Schenck in their company. Previously to their quitting New York a splendid banquet was given to them, and to several American notabilities, by Mr. Cyrus W. Field. Long congratulatory speeches were delivered, smooth sayings abounded on all sides. M. Katakazy, the Russian Envoy, unable to attend himself, proposed by letter as a toast the words "Blessed are the peace-makers;" with what sincerity after-revelations of his conduct were to show. Nowhere was the self-content of the British diplomatists more manifest than in the utterance of Lord De Grey. In answering the toast to her Majesty's High Commissioners, that

nobleman expressed his conviction that the Treaty had been the result of an honest endeavour to meet the just claims of both countries. He did not doubt that had it been written exclusively in London, or exclusively in Washington, it would have contained different provisions from those found in it, but Treaties which are not compromises, and represent only the views of one side, can be dictated only under the shadow of a victorious army. These were not the conventions that are made between free and equal people. He believed that the Treaty was marked by great honesty and frankness. He thought it a most important one; one, the effects of which would not be confined to the great race—for it was one race—the names of whose representatives were signed to it. It contained the enunciation of principles of the highest value to the world at large, and which it well became England and America to have offered to the consideration of other nations. He believed that this document embodied a large improvement upon the admitted principles of international law. The principles laid down were conceived, it was true, in the spirit of what had long been established in the municipal law of both countries; but municipal law is not binding internationally, and it was a great thing to have embodied these principles in an International Treaty; a greater thing yet to have bound ourselves to invite the adherence of other countries to them. There was an even more important consideration. Here, in a public instrument between two countries, was the first important consecration, absolutely the first consecration, so far as he knew, in connexion with burning questions that might have led to the worst consequences, of the great principle that nations, like men, are bad judges of their own quarrels. He believed the principles contained in the Treaty would have a large influence on the world in the cause of the greatest earthly blessing, Peace. The last twelve months, the last few days, in Europe, had given an impressive lesson of the horrors of war. Was there a man who did not feel that any thing which would remove international disputes from the fatal arbitrament of the sword is indeed a step in the advance of humanity? He was proud that it came from the two great Anglo-Saxon nations to consecrate this advance. It seemed to him, that should they have the good fortune to bring this question to a settlement, there would arise a golden opportunity for establishing between Englishmen and Americans the interchange of friendly relations, the close alliance which he believed equally desirable for both peoples. After eloquently elaborating this idea, Lord De Grey said, in conclusion, that if by the approval of the great Assembly to which by the American Constitution their work had been submitted they should be able to bring this undertaking to a successful issue, he and his fellow-commissioners would return to England with the deep satisfaction of feeling that they had taken their share in a noble work, and one that would tend more profoundly perhaps than they could now conceive, to maintain, extend, and confirm the happiness of the two great branches of the common race.

By the definitive arrangements of the Treaty it was settled that five arbitrators should meet at Geneva some months later in the year, one to be chosen by England, one by the United States, and the other three by the neutral Powers of Brazil, Switzerland, and Italy, to decide upon the "Alabama claims." The separate question of the San Juan boundary was to be submitted to the arbitration of the Emperor of Germany. Meanwhile a mixed Commission was to sit at Washington and adjudicate on other classes of claims arising out of the differences between the two countries.

At the close of 1870 a Census had been taken of the whole population of the States. The results, when revised and corrected, were published, as thus :—

Aggregate population of the country, 38,549,987; of whom —	
Whites	33,581,680
Coloured	4,879,323
Indians (in the organized States, which alone	
were included in the Census)	
Chinese	63,196
Japanese	55

While on the subject of population we may notice a valuable report which was presented in April by Mr. Edward Young, the chief of the Bureau of Statistics. He calculated the total immigration into the States since 1820 at 7,553,805 persons, of whom more than half, 3,851,850, were of British origin. Germans counted 2,267,500, Scandinavians 153,928, French immigrants 245,812, Asiatic ditto 109,502. We are tempted also to report a curious deduction from the statistics of the Census, relating to the centre of gravity of the population. It is calculated that, if the country could be imagined to be a plane loaded with inhabitants who are distributed over it in the manner shown by the Census, then this centre of gravity would be the point on which the plane would balance. Years ago the population was densest on the eastern coast, but the centre of gravity has steadily progressed westward. In 1840 this point was on the 39th parallel of latitude, and near the eastern foot of the Cumberland mountains, in Virginia. In 1850 it had moved westward 57 miles, to a point near Parkersburg, on the Ohio river, in West Virginia. In 1860 it was 82 miles farther west, at a point south of Chalcothe, Ohio, and near the extremest western verge of West Virginia. In 1870 the point was 45 miles farther west, at Wilmington, Clinton county, Ohio. The estimate is made that in 1890 this centre of population will be found near Bloomington, Indiana, about 40 miles south-west of Indianapolis.

When we turn from contemplating the progress of the United States' population to considering the state of its trade, we are brought to less satisfactory conclusions by the account which was given of it by the Hon. David A. Wells, formerly Commissioner of Revenue, in an article which he contributed this summer to the *North American Review* of Boston. Mr. Wells had been converted

from its principles of protection to those of free trade by his official experience. He now adduced the following statement of facts to prove the validity of his new faith :—

He observed that the population of the States since 1860 had increased by nearly eight millions ; that there were 25,000 miles more of railways now than then ; that the climate now was not worse than then, nor the soil less fertile, nor the crops decreased ; that the debt was only about one-half the British debt ; that, exclusive of the interest charge, the Government expenses were considerably less than those of England ; and that the interest paid was less per head of the population than that on the British debt. No intelligent man would suppose that the United States were now poorer, or less prosperous, or less able to compete with other nations in the world's markets than in 1860 ; and besides the increase in population, the improvements in manufacturing processes, the spread of railways, and consequent cheapening of transportation, would, combined, make up all the additional burdens that had to be borne by reason of the late civil war. Nevertheless, he stated the fact to be that the people of the United States use less sugar and coffee per head than they did in 1859, and also fewer boots, shoes, hats, and other articles of necessarily universal consumption, while " it is positively known that the consumption of cotton cloth, measured in pounds, was less in 1870, with 39,000,000 of people, than in 1860, with 30,000,000." The people of the United States, he said, not only buy less at home, but they also send less of these and their other home manufactures abroad than they did formerly, and what they do sell abroad they also send in foreign ships. The falling off in the exports of many American skilled industries is demonstrated in a comparative table showing in gold values the exports for 1860 and 1869. Thus, boots and shoes exported decreased from \$782,525 in 1860 to \$356,290 in 1869 ; wool and woollens, from \$389,512 to \$237,325 ; carriages, from \$816,973 to \$299,487 ; candles, from \$760,528 to \$324,995 ; pot and pearl ashes, from \$882,820 to \$187,004 ; books and paper, from \$564,066 to \$290,098 ; manufactured tobacco, from \$3,337,083 to \$2,101,335 ; soap, from \$494,405 to \$384,950 ; trunks and valises, from \$37,748 to \$24,800 ; paints and varnish, from \$223,809 to \$91,452 ; gunpowder, from \$467,972 to \$122,562 ; marble and stone manufactures, from \$176,239 to \$65,515 ; indiarubber manufactures, from \$240,844 to \$128,216 ; beer, ale, and porter, from \$53,573 to \$9,755 ; garden and other seeds, from \$596,910 to \$44,186 ; hides and skins, from \$1,036,260 to \$219,918 ; and animals, from \$1,855,091 to \$689,508. The decreased exportation is in the foregoing individualized, but, taking a general view, the total exportation of American produce to Great Britain, which was in 1860 in gold value \$196,260,000, had decreased in 1869 to a paper currency value of \$163,195,000. The exports to the Spanish West Indies in 1860 were \$13,713,000 gold, and 15,479,000 currency in 1869 ; to Sweden and the Swedish West Indies, in 1860, \$1,513,876 gold,

and in 1869 but \$166,974 currency; to Mexico, in 1860, \$3,338,789 gold, and in 1869, \$3,836,000 currency; to the Sandwich Islands, \$637,489 gold in 1860, and in 1869, \$700,962 currency; and to Canada, \$18,667,000 gold in 1860, and \$17,765,712 currency in 1869. Currency is now depreciated 13 per cent. below gold, and the result shows that, comparing the beginning of the decade with its close, where the exports of the country had not actually decreased they had at least stood still.

Mr. Wells touched also on that notorious evidence of the false American revenue system, the decline of shipping. In the trade between the United States and Brazil in 1860 the number of entries was 345 American and 118 foreign vessels; but in 1869 this had changed to 114 American and 359 foreign vessels. In the trade between the United States and the Argentine Republic there were in 1860 68 entries of American vessels and 8 foreign, while in 1869 there were 39 Americans and 33 foreign. In the direct trade with Great Britain in 1860 the entries were 924 American and 613 foreign vessels, but in 1869 this had changed to 365 American and 1594 foreign. Thus has the foreign trade fallen off—a fact that is in a thousand ways demonstrated; but Mr. Wells went farther, and showed that even the American coasting and fishing tonnage had decreased, notwithstanding the thorough exclusion of foreign vessels from those industries, and their monopoly by Americans. This fact showed that protection had actually been stifling the industry protected. The total American registered and licensed tonnage in the year 1860-1 was 5,539,813 tons, and in 1869-70 but 4,246,507 tons (the fiscal year ending on the 30th of June). In the coasting trade there were in 1860-1 2,657,292 tons, which had decreased in 1869-70 to 2,595,328 tons; and the tonnage employed in the cod fishery, which in 1860-1 was 127,310, had declined in 1869-70 to 82,612. Mr. Wells stated that in 1860 there were employed in New York city alone 15,000 men in building and repairing marine steam-engines, while in 1870 less than 700 men found employment in this, which is one of the highest and best paid branches of American industry, and one in which American artisans formerly excelled. Yet this destruction of a business of which the nation was justly proud had happened, he said, in the face of a rise of wages in the same industry in England. American investigators of iron shipbuilding in Great Britain report that since 1863-4 wages in that trade have advanced about 15 per cent., but notwithstanding this, owing to the use and improvement of new machinery and the better application of knowledge, the cost of construction has declined; and from this Mr. Wells drew the inference that the result of the last ten years in the United States had been to decrease the purchasing power of wages, increase the cost of the manufactured product, diminish consumption, and prevent exports, while in Great Britain the result had been an increase of wages, a decreased cost of the finished product, an increase of consumption, and a large augmentation of exports.

Measures for suppressing the lawless outrages perpetrated by the bands of the so-called Ku-Klux-Klan in South Carolina occupied a good deal of the attention of the Congress. These bands consisted of organized desperadoes, mostly "mean whites," a class sunk in abject degradation, but entertaining the most violent hatred of the negroes, on whom, owing to their great preponderance of numbers, the recent extension of the suffrage had conferred practical supremacy in the State. The matter was much debated both in the Senate and House of Representatives, and assumed a party character as between the advanced Republicans and the Democrats; the latter maintaining that the Ku-Klux movement was insignificant in itself, and was made the most of by the Radicals in order to find an excuse for military interference in the South. The President, to aid the anti-Ku-Klux movement, issued a proclamation in March, warning the disturbers of the peace in South Carolina to disperse.

Much was heard this summer of the "New Departure" doctrines, advocated by a large section of the Democratic party. They were first started in Ohio, and presently all the State Conventions caught them up. The "New Departure" was really a removal of the Democratic platform on to Republican ground. The politicians who adhered to it admitted that the war had settled certain questions beyond all possibility of re-opening. They accepted as undeniable propositions the freedom of every person in the United States, and the right of every male to the privileges of citizenship, on conditions unconnected with distinctions of race or colour. In the legislation, however, which the dominant party had forced upon the country under cover of the constitutional amendments, the New Departure Democrats found sufficient matter to justify opposition. They protested against the political degradation to which the Southern States had been reduced since the war, they demanded a universal amnesty, and they condemned taxation which had for its sole object the protection of Northern manufactures. Their hostility was particularly directed against the "Force Act," passed during the previous Session, by which the President was authorized to interfere under certain circumstances in the internal police of the separate States, a pernicious violation, as they maintained, of the Constitution, which had carefully guarded State independence in such matters from the action of the Federal Government.

On July 12th, New York was the scene of a disturbance caused by the Irish factions, whose rowdyism was a besetting plague of the city. The Orange party insisted on celebrating in their usual fashion their favourite anniversary of the Battle of the Boyne. Their antagonists, the Ribandmen, were resolved to prevent them. Having notified to the authorities that they intended to hold their parade, the Orangemen formed in a body at ten o'clock in the morning, and marched, not more than ninety strong, with scarfs and banners, from Twenty-Ninth-street to Twenty-Third-street, then along Fifth Avenue, Broadway, and other streets and avenues, as far as to Cooper's Institute, where the procession was to terminate.

In anticipation of a riot Governor Hoffmann had ordered the police and regular troops, to the number of about 10,000, to be placed on duty. All went quietly till the Orangemen reached Eighth Avenue and Twenty-Ninth-street. Then some pistols were discharged from the mob. A soldier of the 9th Regiment fell. A scuffle ensued, in which Colonel James Fisk, of Erie Ring notoriety, was knocked into a gutter, and trampled on. Then the whole line of the 84th, and portions of the other regiments, began to fire in an irregular volley. The mob retreated rapidly. The officers of the regiments rushed among their men to stop the firing, and Colonel Varian, who was in chief command, sent the 84th indignantly to the rear. It was afterwards found that about fifty persons had been killed during or in consequence of this day's riot, while the number of wounded amounted to 160. Loud were the complaints of the Ribandmen and Fenians that the procession should have been allowed at all; while the authorities were generally blamed for their want of vigorous and concerted action, and the officers for their lack of control over their troops. The Republican journals denounced "Tammany Hall," and declared that the City Corporation, which held its sittings there, was in fault for the defects of the public governance. Tammany Hall soon had worse sins to answer for.

The corrupt state of the civic government in New York had long been matter of notoriety. A body of politicians, known from their place of meeting by the name of the Tammany Democrats, had for some time past usurped the control of both municipal and State elections; and a "Ring," or self-chosen Committee, of these men of dubious character and low connexions, had gradually got into their hands the absolute direction of public affairs. The "Tammany Ring" played into the hands of another nefarious association, which went by the name of the "Erie Ring;" a chosen gang from among the Directors of the Erie Railway, who had contrived to procure for themselves enormous gains by defrauding the shareholders embarked in that undertaking. James Fisk, Gould, and Lane, the chiefs of the Erie Ring, entered into a close alliance, offensive and defensive, with Oakey Hall, the Mayor of New York, Tweed, Sweeny, and others who held sway at Tammany Hall. Tweed and Sweeny were, by favour of Fisk and his confederates, made Directors of the Erie Railway, and in return, "Tammany" used its influence—and successfully—to corrupt the judicial authorities by whom the numerous lawsuits, brought by indignant shareholders against the Directors of that Railway, had to be decided. The Legislature at Albany having been bribed to pass an Act confirming the Erie Ring in its authority for at least five years, Fisk and his confederates removed from their former place of business, and set up in magnificent style in a marble edifice in New York, from whence they concocted their schemes of further plunder, hand in hand with the magnates of Tammany. So things went on, the outside world well aware of the wholly unprincipled character of the New York administration, yet too timid or indolent to arraign it, until one of the leading news-

papers, the *New York Times*, took upon itself, in the month of July this year, to commence a series of inquiries into the application of the public funds which the Mayor and Corporation had at their disposal.

The actual amount of those funds was from five to six millions sterling *per annum*. Not only did the Tammany Ring spend this revenue at their will, but they monopolised the entire patronage of New York, appointed every policeman and custom-house officer, guaranteed the election of every magistrate and judge, and controlled the State elections. It was an arduous task to endeavour to uproot a power which rested on such vast ramifications. However, the *New York Times* stuck manfully to the work it had undertaken. Almost daily exposures were made in its pages of the misapplication of the city funds. It appeared that in the twenty-six months from January, 1869, to March, 1871, there had been paid a sum of 2,570,000*l.* nominally for the repair and furnishing of the armouries, drill-rooms, and county offices, including 1,130,000*l.* for carpenters' work, furniture, and carpets, 570,000*l.* for plastering and repairs, and 240,000*l.* for plumbing and gasfitting; that the persons to whom these sums were disbursed were few in number and almost unknown as far as any position in trade was concerned; and that the whole of the checks given were endorsed over to a person reputed to be an agent of the officials. The bill for carpets alone, it was calculated, would have sufficed to cover the city park with the most costly fabrics of the kind. These exposures related only to a part of the county expenditures. Of the city expenditures, apparently, no account had been rendered for a very long period. At last the taxpayers were roused to hold a meeting at Cooper's Institute, on the 4th of September, for the purpose of demanding a thorough investigation of the accounts. A committee of seventy was appointed, whose task it should be to enforce all legal remedies, to receive, if possible, the sums of money fraudulently abstracted, and finally, without reference to party, "to obtain a good government and honest officers to administer it."

Contrary to expectation, Judge Barnard, who had hitherto acted in the interests of the Erie and Tammany Rings, granted the injunction for which application was made to him by the indignant taxpayers of New York: and in announcing his decision—which was received in a crowded court with rapturous applause—he was especially severe in his remarks on Hall the Mayor and Connolly the Controller. He said that there had been municipal robbery, and that it was his plain duty, as a judge, to prevent its continuance. It was evident that Connolly was singled out by his late colleagues to be their scape-goat, but it proved not to be so easy to lay all their sins on his shoulders as they had supposed. To the Mayor's demand that he should resign his office, in order that an "honest man" should be substituted in his place, he declined to accede; and his demand for full investigation was supported by public sentiment.

In spite of this signal exposure, such was the power attributed to

the Tammany Ring that when, at the autumn elections, it suffered a total defeat, the surprise of those who wished well to the cause of honesty was almost as great as their satisfaction. Not only did the Republican party carry against the Democrats the City Elections, but it also wrested from them the control of New York State and secured a majority in the State Legislature. The only set off to their triumph was that William M. Tweed, the Commissioner of Public Works, and the worst culprit of the Tammany gang, was actually returned as a member of the Senate. He never ventured, however, to claim his seat. In fact before the year's close he was arrested; for the committee of seventy succeeded in unearthing an accomplice named Keyser, whose name had figured as one of the sham contractors put forward by the Ring to draw the public money. This man had fled to South Carolina after the great meeting at Cooper's Institute; but on communications being subsequently opened with him, he consented to turn "States' Evidence" on condition that his own participation in the frauds of Tammany should be overlooked. Affidavits were then procured, which being laid before the Recorder, obtained the issue of a warrant for Tweed's arrest, and he was accordingly committed for trial. Bail was at first refused, but was eventually granted on application to Judge Barnard, who had long been the known legal protector of the Erie Ring, in spite of a spirited protest from Charles O'Connor, the leader of the prosecution.

Not only in New York, but in other cities and states of the Union, the Tammany discoveries had the effect of throwing discredit on the Democratic party; and they were supposed to have correspondingly advanced the prospects of General Grant's re-election to the Presidency, and to have prevented the possibility of his finding a rival in General Hoffmann of New York—once talked of as a not unlikely successor to the post—whose too cautious abstention from quarrelling with the rogues of Tammany Hall is considered to have fatally disgraced him.

While the Tammany investigations were going on, an important legal proceeding was taking place in the land of the Mormons. The Government of the United States had for some time past been weary of tolerating the social practices of the strange sect who peopled the territory of Utah; and when the Pacific Railway, on its advance to San Francisco, made Salt Lake City one of its stations, a collateral advantage expected from it was that thereby the Mormon States would be brought more easily under the control of the Central Government. In the month of September the Chief Justice of the Utah Territory charged the Grand Jury that bigamy was a crime in Utah as well as in other parts of the United States, and ordered them to bring indictments against any persons who should be guilty of the offence. And not only did he pronounce bigamy to be a felony, but he also laid down the rule that believers in its lawfulness were ineligible as jurors. Several Mormon Elders were summoned and challenged on the plea that they maintained the

"Divine right of polygamy." Under this decisive action a conviction was obtained in the latter part of October against Thomas Hawkins, one of the Mormon Elders, an Englishman by origin. He was sentenced to pay a fine of 500 dols. and to be imprisoned for three years with hard labour, the maximum penalty that could be inflicted for his crime, the Chief Justice said, and almost the maximum fine, but he wished so to apportion his judgment that it should not be so severe as to seem vindictive, or so light as to appear to trifle with justice. The community, he said, ought to learn—and here he attacked the Mormon doctrine—that God does not interpose to rescue criminals from the consequences of their crimes, but, on the contrary, He so orders the affairs of His universe that sooner or later crime stands face to face with justice, and justice is the master. The Mormon newspapers talked of the movement against the sect as a "crusade," and denounced the local officers of Government as the "Utah Ring." No religious belief, they said, could be crushed out by Government action. In the Mormon Tabernacle at Salt Lake City, on the evening of the 28th, an audience of 10,000 people assembled to hear the Elders discuss the situation. Elder George Q. Cannon counselled them to abstain from any acts of violence and to submit to the law, as God would protect them and deliver them from their persecutors. The crusade would only strengthen and glorify them in the end. Their Church would not be overturned; their faith was the inspiration of the Divine Spirit, and would endure for ever. Elder Orson Pratt spoke more boldly, and said he did not want any whining Judge to say to him, as he had said to Hawkins, "I am sorry for you." He wanted no sympathy from any Federal official, and was ready to go to gaol for twenty years, but he desired no pity from such a source. He predicted that God would totally overthrow and annihilate the present persecutors of the Mormons. Undeterred, however, by these indignant protests, the President of the Republic insisted on the uncompromising execution of the new laws, and the next victim proved to be no less a person than Brigham Young himself, the chief of the Mormon Church. Young had already been arraigned when Hawkins's conviction took place. Besides his indictment for bigamy there hovered over him a charge of complicity with other Mormons in the murder of a man named Buck, which had taken place some years previously in furtherance of the interests of the Mormon Church. Young's trial was appointed for the 4th of December, but his friends made great efforts to have it postponed, and it did not actually commence till the 2nd of January, 1872.

Suddenly, on the 8th of October, there shot across the quiet course of history one of those startling catastrophes unconnected with politics or passions, which occasionally form an era in the life of states. A fire broke out in the vast and populous city of Chicago, the city whose rapid growth and prosperity had been the typical pride of the American people, whose aspiring energies had caused it to be termed the "most ambitious" city of the Union.

Chicago is beautifully situated on an inclined plane extending along the shores of Lake Michigan. It was the grand centre both of the export and import trade of the West, and the calamity occurred at a season when that trade was approaching its height. About 400,000 tons of shipping were, directly or indirectly, engaged in it. Twenty-four lines of railway meet at Chicago, and from 200 to 250 trains daily arrive and depart. Its traffic in grain, lumber, and provisions far exceeded any thing known elsewhere; and while its granaries and yards were thus filled, its magnificent warehouses were stored with the manufactured goods and articles of domestic luxury received from Europe in return for these riches. The accident which was at first alleged as the cause of the fire was the upsetting of a kerosene lamp in a wooden barn by the kick of a cow. This fact was afterwards disputed. Sinister suspicions arose that incendiarism had been at work. The fire, it was said, must have burst out in many places at once. Southern malice was hinted at, and the desperate views of some of the Ku-Klux marauders—whether true or not, these surmises created much excitement at the moment. But whatever the cause, so it was, that from ten o'clock on the evening of Sunday the 8th until noon on the 10th the flames, aided by a violent wind from the south-west, raged with tremendous fury. So fierce and rapid was the conflagration, as it came along devouring the houses and licking up the wooden pavement, that the wretched inhabitants of the burning portion, fleeing as fast as they could, were scarcely able to save their lives. Many fell and were trampled to death in the throng; many were burnt. Several streets were blown up in the hope of arresting the flames. At last, a downfall of heavy rain on Tuesday checked their career, and before the evening of that day they were nearly extinguished. The loss of life in this gigantic fire was estimated at 500 persons; the loss of property at \$1,500,000: 100,000 persons were rendered houseless. About one-third of the city was destroyed; the burnt area covering a space of 2600 acres, and including the best part of the business district, with its handsome offices. The people were panic-struck for the moment, and in their excitement threatened to break out into riot. Martial law was proclaimed, and General Sheridan stationed in command. Very soon, however, the excitement subsided; and with an energy and buoyancy of spirit which cannot but call forth the highest admiration, the sober part of the population set to work to remedy this disaster. Nay, even on Wednesday morning, while the ashes of the devastated quarters were still smoking, shops began to reopen, business to recommence, and newspapers to be published. The news was flashed at once by telegrams through all the civilized world, and the sympathy which in calamity is always so unfailingly ready to testify to the brotherhood of nations as well as of fellow-citizens, brought aid in money, and clothing, and provisions from far and near. Large subscriptions were set on foot in all the chief towns of Europe.

Besides the awful fire at Chicago, other conflagrations burst out

about this time in the North-Western States. The entire town of Manistree, in Michigan, was destroyed by fire. 200 houses and 6 mills were burned, and the loss was estimated at \$1,250,000. In Wisconsin, four villages on the Green Bay river were devastated, with a fearful loss of life. The inhabitants were surrounded by the flames, and 150 fugitives were burned alive in a barn. Hundreds of persons were driven into the river: altogether some 500 are said to have perished on this occasion. An unparalleled drought had prevailed in the North-Western States during many weeks, which was supposed to be the cause of the catastrophe. In the St. Clair, Huron, Tuscola, and Sanilac counties of Michigan, Huron city, Forestville, Whiterock, and many other villages were also destroyed, with a vast sacrifice of human life, and heavy losses in cattle, horses, and winter stores.

Mention must be made of hostile proceedings against the inhabitants of the peninsula of Corea in Asia, which took place in the month of June. The causes which led to them were as follows:—

About the close of May Mr. Lowe, the American Envoy in China, and Admiral John Rodgers, commanding the fleet, made an expedition to the peninsula of Corea for the purpose of endeavouring to make a treaty with that nation for the protection of shipwrecked sailors of civilized nations, who, hitherto, when cast upon the shores of the peninsula, had been made slaves, maltreated, and sometimes murdered. The expedition was also accompanied by war-vessels of several other nations. The American Minister and the Corean representatives exchanged professions of amicable intentions. The Coreans did not object to a survey of their coasts and waters. Accordingly, the steamers "Monocacy," "Palos," and four steam launches were sent on the 1st of June to examine the Sable River at a point called "Difficult Passage." While the survey was going on, and the vessels were at a point where navigation was most perilous, masked batteries, manned by several thousand Coreans, were suddenly unmasked, and opened a heavy fire without warning upon the Americans. A French ship was in advance of the fleet, and fought most gallantly, and, the American vessels bearing up, drove the enemy from their works. Then anchoring, the French and Americans threw shells among the retreating Coreans. One of the vessels, the "Monocacy," was slightly injured by knocking upon a sunken rock, but was not disabled. Ten days were allowed, after this affair, to give time for the Corean Government to apologize for the attack on the surveying squadron, should it wish to disavow the act of its subordinates; but no movement of the kind was made, and on the 10th of July an expedition started to avenge the insult to the American flag. The expedition consisted of the same vessels as before, with a landing-party of 550 men, under the command of Captain Blake. Fire was opened upon the Corean forts, under which the landing-party made its approaches. The Coreans fought bravely, but the Americans established themselves upon some heights, from which they could storm the enemy's principal stronghold, and before

long they remained in undisputed mastery of the position. The forts of the Coreans were at once destroyed, the guns spiked, broken, or thrown into the river, magazines exploded, and the wounded Coreans taken on board the "Monocacy." 240 bodies were counted inside the principal fort, and many were killed outside the works.

During this period of General Grant's Presidency an interesting experiment was made on the native Indian tribes, with the view of bringing them by peaceable means within the control of something like civilized habits and relations, and converting them from dangerous enemies to contented friends of the United States Government. At the President's instigation, in December, 1870, a Grand Council of Delegates from different tribes was assembled at Okmulgu, in the Choctaw country, to start the idea of an Indian Republican Government the members and subjects of which should be citizens of the United States. A second Council assembled in June, 1871, when the result of the movement came to be discussed, and a Provisional Government, on the basis proposed, was agreed to. Before the close of the year the Secretary of the Interior presented a report on the whole subject, and from it we learn, in the words of an article in the *Times*, "that the Indian population now under the jurisdiction of the United States is estimated at 321,000 souls. As the estimate for 1850 gave 400,764, it would follow that the numbers of the Red Men have been diminished by about one-fourth in the course of twenty years, and that the decline of the race has been uninterrupted is, indeed, well known. Still, there remain these numbers to be dealt with, and dealt with so that the demands of civilization may be reconciled with the dictates of humanity. It is more than probable that the race will eventually die out, but in the meantime it is desirable to protect the survivors from wrong while removing them from those paths of progress on which a superior race is incessantly advancing. The expedient adopted for this purpose may be described as a species of colonization, conducted under the encouragement and superintendence of Government. Certain areas of territory, selected in suitable localities, and designated by the name of 'reservations,' are allotted to Indian tribes for their own exclusive use and occupation. The bargain depends essentially on this one condition—that so long as the Indians confine themselves to the ground assigned to them they shall be protected from all encroachments by the power and authority of the Government. Of course they may thus be said to surrender their rights over a large territory for permission to retain a portion of it, but nothing could give a more impressive idea of the riches of the American Union in land, than the statements of the Secretary on this point. Something like 600 acres a head is actually allowed to the great body of the colonists. The 'reservations' on which 172,000 Indians are now settled contain 96,155,785 acres, and the aggregate extent of reserved territory is said to be 228,473 square miles, or about four times the area of England and Wales. A particular reservation, specially known as the 'Indian Territory,' and now supporting

about 60,000 of these people, could, according to the Secretary's reckoning, receive the entire aboriginal population of the United States, and yet give 180 acres of land apiece to every man, woman, and child in the colony. It must be admitted, therefore, that these tribes are not actually cramped for room; but their habits of roving are so inveterate, and the instincts of a hunting life so strong, that the greatest difficulty has hitherto been found in keeping them within the boundaries prescribed. At the same time, it is certain they were occasionally ill-used. Advantage was taken of their ignorance or weakness to encroach upon their lands; the stipulations made in their favour were imperfectly observed, and no great success, indeed, was obtained until new and special agencies were enlisted in the work."

General Grant's Message to the Congress, which opened its winter session the first week in October, was a short but a very bright-coloured production. He dwelt on the great prosperity of the past year, and the rapid growth in the country of all the elements of wealth and stability. He spoke with satisfaction of the friendly relations subsisting with all foreign nations, and of their goodwill towards America, as shown by their help in periods of physical disaster. He described the Treaty of Washington, and asked for the necessary appropriations for the Commissioners. Referring to the principles of public law laid down in the Treaty, for which the United States had long contended, he stated that negotiations were now going on as to the form of note by which they were to be brought to the attention of other foreign Powers. He recommended the legislation necessary to enforce the fishery and other provisions of the Treaty, hoping that it might become operative before the American fishermen made their arrangements for the coming season. He said that he had addressed communications to the Governors of the States bordering on Canada relative to the legislation necessary for the common use of canals, lakes, and rivers on the border, and recommended Congress to make provision for ascertaining the true position of the 49th parallel of latitude, where it forms the boundary. The expedition to Corea, he said, had been sent in aid of an endeavour to conclude a treaty with that Power, but the object had been found impracticable. He alluded to the disturbed condition of Cuba, and expressed his hope that all pending questions with Spain growing out of the state of affairs in that island might be adjusted in the spirit of peace and conciliation which had hitherto guided the two Powers in their treatment of such questions. The abolition of slavery in Brazil was mentioned as a matter for congratulation. The President alluded to the visit of the Grand Duke Alexis of Russia, who had recently arrived in the United States, and had been most hospitably received, as a proof that no desire existed on the part of Russia to diminish the existing terms of cordiality. He then referred to a matter which had been creating some embarrassment between the two Governments—the officious conduct and consequent dismissal from his post

of M. Katakazy, the Russian Minister at Washington. This official had been convicted of intriguing among American politicians to prevent the conclusion of the Treaty of Washington. The inexcusable course taken by the Russian Minister at Washington, the President said, had rendered it necessary to ask for his recall, and to decline any longer to receive that functionary as a diplomatic representative. It was incompatible with the maintenance of self-respect and with a due regard to the dignity of the country to permit M. Katakazy to continue to hold intercourse with the Government of the United States after his personal abuse of Government officials, and while he was persistently interfering through various channels with the relations between the United States and other Powers. In accordance with these wishes the Government had been relieved of further intercourse with M. Katakazy, and the management of the affairs of the Russian Legation had passed into the hands of a gentleman entirely unobjectionable. The President recommended a diminution of the burdens on the people by modifying both the tax and tariff laws, and then proceeded to discuss other details of domestic concern. In alluding to the position of the South, he proposed that the disfranchisement by classes of former rebels should no longer be retained, but that all should be readmitted to the possession of political privileges, with the exception of a few principals, to be disqualified by name. He mentioned that important reforms in the public offices were in contemplation, and that in fact a Civil Service Commission had been appointed to draw up rules regulating the admission to the clerkships, &c., in the different departments of the State.

The most important document accompanying the Message was the Report of Mr. Boutwell, the Secretary of the Treasury. We here quote some of the comments upon it of the English paper, the *Economist*, which, after denouncing the well-known Protectionist views of Mr. Boutwell in matters of Trade and Commerce, continues: "In a strictly Treasury sense—apart, that is, from the economic effects of the taxes and expenditure on the country—it would hardly be possible to imagine more flourishing finances than those of America. First of all during the last two years the surpluses have been gigantic:—

In 1869-70 the surplus was £18,627,000

In 1870-71 it is 16,712,000

Total surplus of two years . . . £35,339,000

"The whole of this vast sum has been available for the reduction of the debt. Such a fact is unprecedented in financial history. It may be due partly to the American Constitution, which separates so completely between legislation and administration, the result in fiscal matters being that taxes may be left in existence even contrary to the wish of the Executive, and that the Treasury gets the benefit of those taxes. But, whatever may be the cause, the Americans are entitled to credit for submitting in some way to

great, even if unnecessary, sacrifices for a national object. There was room to suppose that the great reductions effected immediately after the war by means of the outstanding war taxation, and when the yield of the taxes could not be exactly calculated, were to some extent accidental; but the return to the former rate of repayment must be admitted to be more deliberate.

“The next satisfactory fact is the remarkable growth of the revenue over the estimate. It is not true that the large surpluses above mentioned were wholly intended, though the purpose was to have very large surpluses. In addition there has been an elasticity in the growth of American revenue even more remarkable than that with which we are familiar at home. We subjoin below the estimate for 1870-71, as well as the result, and, considering that the estimate was made when nearly six months of the year had passed, the excess of the actual result over the reckoning is indeed most wonderful. The leading changes are,—

	Estimated.	Accrued.	Increase.
Revenue . .	£65,835,000 . .	£70,276,000 . .	£4,441,000
Customs . .	34,050,000 . .	37,816,000 . .	3,766,000

It is not always creditable to a Finance Minister to be out in his calculations so much, even when the balance comes in on the right side; but in the peculiar circumstances of America the error was more venial, the growth being comparatively unexpected according to recent experience. That it has occurred is striking proof of the vigour of American industry and the rapidity of the national growth—the most cardinal fact, after all, in American finance. The people are so industrious, and nature has been so bountiful, that, in spite of a system of Protection which would have ruined outright any old country, and which has indisputably done infinite damage to the Americans, the country grows at a rate without example elsewhere, except perhaps in England in a prosperous epoch like the present.

“As regards the prospects of American finance the new facts are very important. The new House of Representatives is certainly leavened to a remarkable extent with Freetraders and revenue reformers, and it is impossible that the Protectionists will have their own way in it as they have hitherto done. Both President Grant and his Secretary to the Treasury suggest important concessions to this party. President Grant, while mainly recommending the abolition of internal taxes, except stamps and the excise on alcoholic drinks and tobacco, also proposes a readjustment of the tariff. His suggestion is—‘That a careful estimate be made of the amount of surplus revenue collected under the present laws, after providing the current expenses of the Government, the interest account and a sinking fund, and that this surplus be reduced in such manner as to afford the greatest relief to the greatest number. There are many articles not produced at home, but which enter largely into general consumption through articles

which are manufactured at home—such as medicines compounded, &c.—from which very little revenue is derived, but which enter into general use. All such articles I recommend to be placed on the free list. Should a further reduction prove advisable, I would then recommend that it be made upon those articles which can best bear it, without disturbing home production or reducing the wages of American labour.’ This language, though still Protectionist, is plainly framed with a view to conciliate people who are not Protectionist; and the tone is such that a revisal in a Free-trade spirit might properly be covered by it. Protection, we should infer, is to be maintained in theory, but extensively given up in practice, and the measures suggested are such that by the gradual accumulation of similar measures—and one leads to the other—Free-trade would in the end be arrived at. A reduction upon articles ‘which can best bear it without disturbing home production or reducing the wages of American labour’ is, in fact, the exact kind of reduction which Sir Robert Peel began between 1843 and 1846, and which has ended as we see.

“Mr. Boutwell’s suggestion is rather less satisfactory, but it still admits a great deal of the Free-trade demand. He says, ‘I respectfully recommend to the consideration of Congress the reduction of the duties on salt to the extent of 50 per cent.; the duty on bituminous coal to 50c. per ton; the reduction of the duty on raw hides and skins, and the removal of all duties from a large class of articles produced in other countries which enter into the arts and manufactures of this country, and which are not produced in the United States, and the revenue from which is inconsiderable. Such a list, with the revenue derived from each article, is in course of preparation, and will be submitted to Congress. The removal of duties from a large class of articles used in manufactures, and the reduction of the duties upon coal, furnish an opportunity for a moderate decrease of the rates of duties upon those products the cost of which will be diminished by these changes.’ The abolition of the duties here described would be a great step in advance. The reduction of the duties on salt, coal, and hides would diminish materially the ‘protection’ now given to certain trades, and the abolition of minor duties would have an importance in relieving trade, as we all know, out of all proportion to the mere amount of the duties collected. But the most important point is that these abolitions and reductions are to be used as furnishing an ‘opportunity for a moderate decrease of the rates of duties upon these products, the cost of which will be diminished by these changes.’ It is impossible to misunderstand the glance here thrown at the iron, cotton, and woollen manufactures, the products of which are all enhanced in cost by the duties to be abolished. The abolition or reduction of one duty inevitably leads to the abatement of others, and Mr. Boutwell could not go so far as he proposes without practically acknowledging the failure of that thorough-going Protection which the United States has hitherto practised.

“Such is the position and such are the concessions now offered to Free-traders by ardent Protectionists. We infer that Free-trade principles are now on the eve of a very considerable triumph in the United States, and, with the quickness of action characteristic of Americans, it would not be surprising to see the system thrown down almost as quickly as it was set up. Mr. Wells predicts ‘that ten years will not elapse before every vestige of restrictive and discriminating legislation will be stricken from the national statute book.’ The consummation may to all appearance come before that, and one of the most potent causes in producing it will have been these very studies in political economy which Mr. Wells issued from time to time in his character of Commissioner of Revenue, and the subsequent essays in which he has enforced the lessons. The sort of facts he observed and reasoned upon were familiar to every student of economic science, and were only what might have been expected; but the American facts were on so large and complete a scale that Mr. Wells’s account of the experiments will long remain among the most valuable contributions to the literature of political economy. He has the credit, too, of long ago recommending those very changes which Mr. Boutwell and President Grant are now advocating—in particular, the abolition of small duties yielding little revenue. He was not listened to at the time, but the country is coming round to his views, and he must gain in authority at home accordingly.”

The President’s Message was well received, and at this time his chances for re-election appeared to be all but decisive. The first business that came up for debate in the Senate regarded the recent frauds at New York, and the proposed appointment of a Committee for the thorough investigation of every branch of the Government service. An affirmative resolution was carried, and an inquiry was ordered to ascertain whether any foreign Minister of the United States was publicly connected with any speculative transactions, or had given the use of his name in their furtherance.

The new Apportionment Bill was passed in the House of Representatives on the 14th, making the new representation in that House 283 in number. This is an increase of forty members over the number in the present House, and gives one representative for about every 133,000 of the population. New Hampshire and Vermont by the Bill each lose one member, but almost every other State gains, the largest gains being,—in Illinois five, and Iowa and Michigan each three. The Bill also provides that no State shall hereafter be admitted to the Union which has not sufficient population to entitle it to one representative, a prohibition which will interfere with the aspirations of Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico.

The year closed with some sounds of the ubiquitous “International.” Though there existed branches of the Society in many American cities, it is not believed at present to command a numerous or influential following. It flourished chiefly, however, at New York; and the occasion of Rossel’s execution was seized by its

members to solemnize a funeral procession in his honour. Processions on Sunday are not customary in America, and the authorities desired that if the demonstration must take place, it should be on some other day of the week. The Internationalists were indignant, and appealed to Governor Hoffmann; but he declined to interfere with the previous dictum. At a meeting of the party, a motion was then carried to substitute Christmas Day, but a few malcontents persisted in assembling on Sunday the 10th, and were dispersed by the police. The Internationalists then determined on claiming the following Sunday for their parade; and this time both Governor Hoffmann and the police authorities gave way to their demand. The meeting, however, was but a poor one; only about two thousand persons marched in line. Order was maintained. Among the most conspicuous banners were three bearing the respective mottoes, "The spirit of the Commune expands as the axe is laid on the necks of its martyrs;" "The world is our country: to do good our religion;" "And they had all things in common."

BRAZIL.

PEDRO II., the able and enlightened sovereign who, though still in the prime of life, had sat for forty years on the throne of Brazil, quitted his dominion in the early summer of this year, leaving his daughter, Princess Isabel, Countess d'Eu, as Regent, and paid a long visit to Europe. He landed first at Lisbon, and was welcomed by his royal kinsman, the son of Maria da Gloria. Afterwards he went to England; then returned to the Continent; and in the middle of the winter he was at Paris. Every where his activity of movement, his zeal of inquiry into things and institutions, and his rapid intelligence, were topics of remark.

While the Emperor was absent from his country, the Brazilian Chambers passed an Act which Government had long been anxious to carry through, and on the 28th of September it was decreed that Slavery should be abolished throughout the empire of Brazil. The abolition was not to be immediate or abrupt. Existing slaves were in many cases to be slaves still; but facilities for emancipation were given, and all children born of female slaves after the day on which the law passed were to be free unconditionally.

ARGENTINE REPUBLIC.

A TERRIBLE plague at Buenos Ayres this year deserves to be recorded. It commenced in December, 1870, and through January and February it rapidly increased. The English residents removed into the suburbs and country; and they were followed by the native population in such numbers that the means of conveyance were hardly sufficient to carry them away. At its height the mortality

amounted to 700 *per diem*. The pestilence was caused in great measure by the crowded and filthy condition of the *conventillos*, or cheap lodging-houses, which were an institution in Buenos Ayres. It was not till the middle of February that the Government plucked up courage to interfere with them. When at last they were broken up, and the huddled-up denizens turned into the country, the infecting influences by degrees subsided.

ASIA.

IN this quarter of the world the foreign historian of the year has to record no important political events, but some physical calamities on a large scale : to wit, the spread of the cholera in *Arabia*; violent inundations at Tientsin and other places in *China*; and a very terrible famine in *Persia*, for which charitable collections were set on foot in England.

"A population of four millions," says the *Times* of October 26th, "scattered over an arid country about as large as Great Britain and France together, is being swept away by thousands and tens of thousands. It appears that a large number of the inhabitants of Persia belong to wandering tribes whose sustenance is provided by their flocks and herds, and who are, therefore, entirely dependent on pasturage. Three years of drought have almost totally destroyed the grass on the mountain sides and in the valleys, and the people and their cattle have been perishing together. The suffering may have been less severe in the cultivated districts; but even there it has been terrible, and the accounts from the cities alone are sufficiently appalling. At Ispahan, the capital, 12,000 people have died of want, and more than double that number in the province. Out of a population of 10,000 at Kazeroon, as many as 4000 have been starved to death, 4000 more have fled the place, and children have been trampled to death underfoot in the scramble for relief. It is impossible to look for any natural recovery until next spring, and the country possesses none of the ordinary means of transport and supply. There are not even, according to Sir Henry Rawlinson, the means of transporting grain from one district to another. The people are, as it were, perishing in a wilderness, and their future sufferings must be awful unless other nations come to their rescue."

Speaking of this Persian famine, M. Arminius Vambéry says, "Agriculture in Persia is in a very primitive state; the want of water is so great that the fields have to be irrigated by subterranean canals, which extend across the country for miles, and the peasant seldom cultivates more than what is required for his household, as the people live on nothing but vegetables for four months in the year. There is, consequently, never any considerable superfluity of corn, and the results of a bad harvest are terrible. . . . The governors of the various provinces, and all the members of the

ruling dynasty, have collected all the reserves of corn, and are selling it at extraordinary high prices to the starving population. . . . The King himself does not take part in this disgraceful trade, but he seems to be troubled but little with the anxieties of government, for he passes about ten months of the year in hunting, and during that time the greatest catastrophes may fall on his country without any one coming forward to remedy them. Is it surprising that under such circumstances the people should take their destinies into their own hands? Already a rebellion has broken out in Shiraz against the ruling prince, Yemin-ed-Dowlet. Similar outbreaks have taken place in Yezd, Kirman, and Tabriz. . . . Every where political parties are springing up, some desiring a Russian, others an English occupation of Persia; while a powerful national party wishes to put on the throne Abbas Mirza, the brother of the Shah, who lives on an English pension at Bagdad."

RETROSPECT

OF

LITERATURE, ART, AND SCIENCE IN 1871.

LITERATURE.

THE year 1871 will perhaps not be conspicuous in the annals of future literary historians as the date of the appearance of any book of first-rate excellence. We must, of course, speak with due reserve, for such books are not always discovered by contemporaries, and amongst the masses of literature which have filled the shelves of our circulating libraries it is possible that there may be some system of philosophy or politics destined to change the face of the world, or some poem which our grandchildren will be learning by heart and admiring as a masterpiece of the Victorian era. It may be so, for 176 new books of poetry appeared in 1871, to say nothing of 155 new novels, whilst there were 562 contributions to theological literature, and a proportional quantity of works of a different description. Now, as we can make no pretensions to have read through the whole of this vast mass; as we have, moreover, learnt by sad examples that the critics who praise and the critics who damn are alike fallible, we must be content to run the risk of omitting some works which really deserve praise, and of noticing others which will have but an ephemeral existence. All that we can profess to do with any certainty is to give a brief account of those books which have made the widest impression upon the public, or which have excited most interest amongst the smaller circle who claim to be qualified judges. Even if the popularity has been fleeting, the fact that it once existed is of some interest; and it is worth while to record the opinions of critics by office, even if the only result is to illustrate once more their liability to error.

We shall begin by noticing two small publications which come under the first category, and which enjoyed a popularity significant at any rate of the state of the national feeling at the time. We refer to the two little pamphlets called the "Battle of Dorking" and the "Fight at Dame Europa's School." Both of them owed their origin to the Franco-Prussian war. The "Battle of Dorking" originally appeared in "Blackwood's Magazine." It was a bit of imaginary history, intended to illustrate the unprepared state of this country to resist a foreign invasion. It was in the form of recollections by an ~~old~~ volunteer, supposed to have been engaged in the campaign which took place when a German army had landed on the south coast and was advancing London. The critical action took place at Dorking, and ended in the defeat of the English forces after a gallant engagement. The stor

ingeniously contrived to illustrate the defects of our military organization; and showed how, from no want of physical courage or of patriotic feeling, a mixed force of regulars, militia, and volunteers was placed at a terrible disadvantage when confronted by thoroughly disciplined and admirably commanded troops. The design, though ingenious, was not in itself remarkably original. The story, however, owed its success not merely to the degree in which it corresponded to the feelings of the time, but to the marked literary skill with which a number of picturesque details were combined so as to produce a startling verisimilitude. The incidents were, of course, borrowed more or less from the contemporary records of the Continental war. They were, however, skilfully adapted to the local peculiarities of English life and scenery, and critics were not wanting who declared that nothing more excellent had been done in this particular way since the time of Defoe. We shall not attempt to say how far this judgment may be confirmed when we have had time for cooler observation. We shall only add that the secret of the authorship has not yet been revealed, although it has been publicly stated and not contradicted that Colonel Chesney, the head of the new Indian Civil Engineering College at Cooper's Hill, was the author in question.

The other pamphlet to which we have referred enjoyed a popularity which perhaps requires more explanation. The allegory sets forth the details of a disturbance which had begun in Dame Europa's School by a thrashing administered by William to Louis, whilst the other boys, and especially John, look on without interference. When Louis has been well thrashed, he begs John to help him:—

“ ‘What can I do?’ says John. ‘I have no power; besides, you began.’ ‘Well, thank you kindly then, John, for—the sticking-plaster.’ But when William and Louis do not appear at dinner-time, Dame Europa takes up the matter, and, learning how the case is from the small boys, she demands of John why he had not separated the two combatants. ‘Please, ma’am, because I was a neutral,’ answers John. ‘A what, sir?’ ‘A neutral, ma’am.’ ‘Just precisely what you had no business to be,’ replies the Dame. ‘Any baby can be that; I might as well have made little George here a monitor if I had meant him to have nothing to do.’ John urges that he did take a side—indeed, both sides: the little boys tittering cry in chorus that ‘he sucked up to both of them.’ And then the Dame gives John a smart lecture. She says that she has long watched his career with pain, and had seen him content to sacrifice duty, influence, and honour for the sake of money. Nobody cares now what he thinks or says, because he has grown a sloven and a screw. He has, instead of making them desist, been sitting in his shop coining coppers out of his schoolfellows’ wounds and misery. It is in vain he pleads that ‘Louis began, and that William is only defending his fatherland.’ It is very like defence, the Dame observes contemptuously, to chase a boy half across the playground, spoil his flower-beds, and try to kick him and his armour to pieces. Finally, as being unfit for his post, John is to be dismissed from the monitorship; but the chorus of small boys having loudly represented the excellence of his conduct in the matter of giving cold water, plaister, lint, &c., and ‘doing all kinds of things’ for the two culprits, he is eventually permitted to remain monitor on condition of future good conduct. ‘If it be really true that the head and champion of the school is thoroughly beaten by circumstances—utterly at a loss at some critical moment what is the right

thing to do—let him confess at once that he is unequal to the place; that he is not the boy we took him for; that his courage has been overrated, and his reputation as a hero too cheaply earned; that for all his vaunted influence with others he is too weak to stay an unrighteous strife, to avert a storm of cruel, savage blows; to spare the infliction of wounds which will lie gaping and unhealed for long, long years to come, bearing on their ghastly face a bitter hatred of the foe that dealt them, and contempt for the ‘neutral’ friend who calmly looked on.”

We need not discuss the moral. It suited the temper of the day; and the apologue enjoyed a wonderful popularity. “*Dame Europa*” and the “*Battle of Dorking*” both enjoyed a circulation, as it was said, of near 200,000. Independently of any question as to their literary merits, which we cannot reckon very highly in the last case, the result is certainly worth notice as illustrative of contemporary feeling.

Of various other books which resulted from the war, we shall only mention two, both of which originally appeared in the columns of the *Daily News*. That paper obtained a great reputation for the excellence of its war correspondence. A volume, containing a large selection from that part of it which described the campaign, both from the French and German point of view, was published, and obtained a deserved success. A more curious and characteristic book contained a description of Paris during the siege, by a gentleman who described himself as “the besieged resident.” It was marked by a peculiar humour, cynical enough, but also undeniably amusing. Few more graphic accounts of the feelings of an inhabitant of a town under such circumstances have ever been published, and they were not the less remarkable because he was in a state of imperfect sympathy with most of his fellow-sufferers, which left him at full leisure to observe their foibles, and indeed to ridicule them unsparingly. Not that he spared himself. There is an amusing sincerity in his statement, on hearing that the bombardment was likely to injure the orchids in the hot-houses, and the Venuses in the galleries. “I know for my part,” he says, “that I would rather that every statue and every plant in the world were shattered to atoms by shells than that I were.” The tone thus indicated pervades most of the narrative. We will quote a passage in which the “besieged resident” describes his feelings on finding himself finally shut up irremediably in the doomed city, and realizing the horrors of his fate.

He had been seized with a horrible feeling that he should some day or other marry “a hideous old woman, like unto one of Macbeth’s witches,” who was in the habit of making his bed. The petroleum of the lamps on the boulevards was getting too much for him, and he was growing tired of hearing, night after night, the undertakers in the room above him nail up the coffins of those who had died during the day. At last, on December the 29th—immediately, it will be observed, before the appointed time at which the bombardment of the city was to begin—the “psychological moment” arrived, and we find the Resident exclaiming, in a strain of pathos which will go to many a heart,—

“I am looking forward with horrible misgivings to the time when I shall have no more money, so that I shall, perhaps, be thankful for being lodged and fed at the public expense. My banker has withdrawn from Paris, and his representative declines to look at my bill, although I offer ruinous interest.

As for friends, they are all in a like condition, for no one expected the siege to last so long. At my hotel need I observe that I do not pay my bill, but in hotels the guests may ring in vain now for food. I sleep on credit in a gorgeous bed, a pauper. The room is large. I wish it were smaller, for the firewood comes from trees just cut down, and it takes an hour to get the logs to light, and then they only smoulder, and emit no heat. The thermometer in my grand room, with its silken curtains, is usually at freezing point. Then my clothes. I am seedy, very seedy. When I call upon a friend the porter eyes me distrustfully. In the streets the beggars never ask me for alms; on the contrary, they eye me suspiciously when I approach them as a possible competitor. The other day I had some newspapers in my hand. An old gentleman took one from me, and paid me for it. I had read it, so I pocketed the halfpence."

We have been informed that when this touching lament was first published numbers of sympathetic letters were addressed to the office of the journal in which it appeared, the burden of all of them being, "Do not let the Besieged Resident starve." But the position of the Besieged One was in a pecuniary point of view irremediable, inasmuch as Paris (except by shells) was unapproachable, and for more than a month he had to suffer the torments of a poverty which had already, in a more or less picturesque manner, made itself felt in his garments, and threatened within no great lapse of time to inconvenience him through his food, or, rather, the absence thereof. It had already struck him that he had done wrong in eating "dog, the friend of man," nor does he seem to have devoured with conscientious relish either "the noble steed," or "the patient ass." Some of his Parisian friends, however, took more kindly to the novel victual, and one of them showed him, with perfect equanimity, a fine cat which he was fattening for Christmas, and which (regarding Grimalkin for the occasion as a turkey) he proposed to surround with mice in lieu of sausages. This idea, by the way, of garnishing a cooked animal (as if in irony) with its favourite food is borrowed from the Russians, who serve up their *ryaptchik* with a sauce composed of the berries on which that partridge-like bird loves to feed. The dogs, it appears, found out at last that human beings had taken to eating them, so that "the humblest of street curs would growl when any one looked at him." Among stories illustrating the sagacity of dogs, which the Resident commends to the notice of dog-fancying editors of Christmas books, are two which, as he himself discredits them, we also decline to accept as true. One tells of a man who, having been followed a mile by a party of dogs, could not imagine to what their attentions were due, until he remembered that he had eaten a rat for breakfast. The other deals with the sensations of a man who had devoured a dog called "Fox," and who, whenever the name "Fox" was pronounced, felt an irresistible impulse to spring from his seat.

The story thus told is undoubtedly interesting, though persons of an amiable turn of mind would perhaps have preferred a greater infusion of amiable sentiment. There is a ludicrous side to all horrible things, if we choose to dwell upon it; but perhaps it is better when relieved against a background of deeper feeling.

We turn, however, from books produced by the incidents of the time, to mention some of the very interesting biographies which have recently appeared of contemporaries recently deceased. The first place is clearly due

to Mr. Forster's remarkable biography of Dickens. The popular interest in his hero is remarkably attested by the fact that the book (of which the first volume alone has been published) only appeared in November, and that by the end of the year it was in its ninth edition. That part of the interest which was due to the intrinsic merits of the book must be divided between the biographer and his subject in very unequal shares. Mr. Forster's own part, to say the truth, does not strike us as in any way above the usual standard. Perhaps Mr. Forster himself is a little too prominent, and, at any rate, he does not succeed in setting before us a very vivid portrait of Dickens. But a large part of the book consists of a fragmentary autobiography and of letters. The letters from America possess much interest in themselves, and more especially as containing much of the raw material upon which the remarkable scenes in "Martin Chuzzlewit" were afterwards founded. We think, however, that a still greater interest will be generally found in Dickens's own description of his early youth. This part of the story probably took most readers by surprise. That early observation must have supplied Dickens with much of his wonderful knowledge of struggling poverty was sufficiently obvious. It was equally plain that much of "David Copperfield" was autobiography disguised. But few readers could have guessed the degree to which an autobiographical sketch already written supplied the materials, and even the terms of expression, for a great part of his well-known novels. It is a remarkable peculiarity of the fragment now published that wherever it differs from the version of it published in "David Copperfield" it differs from it by being more wrought up. Most men having thus to deal with a chapter from their own life would have found it necessary to dress it in more vivid colours, to make the feeling more intense, to strive to excite in the reader's mind a stronger sympathy for the hero of the novel than could be created by unvarnished facts. Dickens felt no such need. Wherever the autobiography and the novel part company it is by reason of omissions or softenings down in the novel. It is worth while to compare a few passages. This is David Copperfield speaking —

"It is a matter of some surprise to me even now that I can have been so easily thrown away at such an age. A child of excellent abilities, and with strong powers of observation, quick, eager, delicate, and soon hurt bodily or mentally, it seems wonderful to me that no one should have made any sign in my behalf."

This is the autobiography :—

"It is wonderful to me how I could have been so easily cast away at such an age. It is wonderful to me that even after my descent into the poor little drudge I had been since we came to London, no one had compassion enough on me—a child of singular abilities, quick, eager, delicate, and soon hurt bodily or mentally—to suggest that something might have been spared, as certainly it might have been, to place me at any common school. . . . My father and mother were quite satisfied. They could hardly have been more so if I had been twenty years of age, distinguished at a grammar school and going to Cambridge."

Or take the sentence in which David Copperfield describes his loneliness :—
 "From Monday morning to Saturday night I had no advice, no counsel, no encouragement, no consolation, no assistance, no support of any kind, from any one that I can call to mind, as I hope to go to heaven." And compare

with it the parallel sentences in the autobiography :—"I suppose my lodging was paid for by my father. I certainly did not pay it myself; and I certainly had no other assistance whatever (the making of my clothes, I think, excepted) from Monday morning until Saturday night. No advice, no counsel, no encouragement, no consolation, no support from any one that I can call to mind, so help me God!" Again, in "David Copperfield," the chapters which deal with his life at Murdstone and Grimby's are thus introduced :—"I now approach a period of my life which I can never lose the remembrance of while I remember any thing, and the recollection of which has often, without my invocation, come before me like a ghost, and haunted happier times." This retains the purport of the corresponding paragraphs in the autobiography, but the details given in the latter convey a far stronger impression of the extremity of horror which the recollection always awakened in him :—

"Until old Hungerford Market was pulled down, until old Hungerford-stairs were destroyed, and the very nature of the ground changed, I never had the courage to go back to the place where my servitude began. I never saw it. I could not endure to go near it. For many years when I came to Robert Warren's in the Strand [the rival blacking warehouse] I crossed over to the opposite side of the way to avoid a certain smell of the cement they put upon the blacking corks, which reminded me of what I was once. It was a very long time before I liked to go up Chandos-street. My old way home by the Borough made me cry after my eldest child could speak."

This feeling has nothing in common with that which sometimes leads successful men to put aside from them all recollections of their less fortunate youth. On the contrary, upon every other part of his childish life Dickens seems always to have dwelt with extreme pleasure. The sense of repugnance excited by the thought of these particular incidents is strangely strong, considering that Dickens sustained no permanent injury from having undergone them. It is more like the feeling with which a man looks back to a period of poverty which cost him the life of a wife or child. There is something vindictive about his compassion for his childish self, something of that overmastering sense of injustice which many men feel when they see present wrong done to others and have no power to help them, but which few retain in regard to wrong done to themselves of which no trace has remained by them. One instance of this is his reference to his mother's wish that he should go back to the blacking warehouse after his father had quarrelled with the proprietor. "My mother set herself to accommodate the quarrel, and did so the next day. . . . My father said I should go back no more, and should go to school. I do not write resentfully or angrily, for I know how all these things have helped to make me what I am; but I never afterwards forgot, I never shall forget, I never can forget, that my mother was warm for my being sent back."

The impression thus produced is not altogether pleasant. Neither is it quite agreeable to discover, as appears to be the case, that Micawber was a portrait for which Dickens's father was the original. Though we feel a certain kindness for that poor old adventurer, few parents would like to be handed down to posterity in such a fashion by their affectionate offspring. Our admiration for the extraordinary ability with which he turned these early experiences to account will of course be increased, though our admiration for his personal character may not be affected in the same way. An intense sensibility, and

a marvellous power of catching at least the first aspect of things are amongst the endowments most likely to be precocious; and Dickens possessed them to the end of his life to an almost unsurpassed degree. It is enough to remark that many of the most striking scenes in "Pickwick" and "Oliver Twist," in "Dombey and Son," in "Bleak House," in "Great Expectations," and in many of his other writings, as well as in "David Copperfield," are simple reproductions of his childish experiences. Few more curious revelations of a literary kind have ever been made, and we shall content ourselves with drawing attention to them. It is scarcely to be expected that the remainder of the biography can possess equal interest, but these pages well deserve to be studied by every one who takes an interest in literature or in the psychological development of the most popular author who has ever written in the English language.

After speaking of Dickens it is not unnatural to pass to one who was a warm friend and admirer, the late Mr. Harness, whose "Literary Life" has just been published by the Rev. A. G. L'Estrange. Mr. Harness formed a connecting link between the present and the past generation of English authors. Though possessed of many of the gifts which render a man an agreeable companion and a warm friend, his claim to memory rests chiefly upon the distinguished authors with whom he formed acquaintance. The earliest of these acquaintances was with Lord Byron, who protected him at Harrow, and retained a friendship for him until the noble poet went abroad for the last time. Personally he declared he knew nothing but good of Byron, and he thought that the evil of his after-conduct was due in large measure to the unhappy circumstances in which he was placed. It is but natural that Mr. Harness should have formed an unfavourable opinion of Lady Byron, "she was almost the only young, pretty, well-dressed girl we ever saw," he said, "who carried no cheerfulness along with her"—and it is well known that he treated Mrs. Stowe's scandal with contempt, declaring it to be as untrue as it was revolting. Mr. Harness, however, allows that Byron had a morbid love of a bad reputation, and many of the stories told about him are probably due to this cause.

"If I could remember," said Harness, "and were willing to repeat the various misdoings which I have from time to time heard him attribute to himself, I could fill a volume. He told me more than once that his father was insane, and killed himself. I shall never forget the manner in which he first told me this. While washing his hands, and singing a gay Neapolitan air, he stopped, looked round at me, and said, 'There always was a madness in the family.' Then, after continuing his washing and his song, as if speaking of a matter of the slightest indifference, 'My father cut his throat.' The contrast between the tenor of the subject and the levity of the expression was fearfully painful, it was like a stanza of 'Don Juan.' In this instance I had no doubt that the fact was as he related it, but in speaking of it only a few years since to an old lady in whom I had perfect confidence, she assured me that it was not so; that Mr. Byron, who was her cousin, had been extremely wild, but was quite sane, and had died quietly in his bed."

Mr. Harness was an ardent admirer of Shakspeare; he delighted in Jane Austin. As a child, he had known Joseph Warton, the able commentator on Pope; in his manhood he was the warm friend of Mrs. Siddons, and of Joanna Baillie; he knew Sheridan and was intimate with Rogers; he was

acquainted with Scott, Coleridge, Moore, Washington Irving, Daniel Webster, Theodore Hook, and Crabb Robinson. Though conscientious in the discharge of his clerical duties, his tastes were rather literary than theological, and he says little of his friends amongst the clergy. Here, however, is an anecdote of Dr. Phillpotts, the late Bishop of Exeter, which is characteristic in its way.

"One day his lawyers were dining with him, and he wished his wife to retire from the table early that he might discuss with them his course of action in one of those unfortunate suits in which he was so constantly involved. The lady, however, found the legal gentlemen agreeable, and notwithstanding repeated nods and winks and hints from her lord, remained immovable in her place. At length, she understood his meaning, and rose hurriedly to depart. 'What! so soon, my love?' demanded the Bishop blandly, as he opened the door for her with an obsequious bow."

We have said enough to indicate the character of the volume. It is loosely put together, and as a piece of literary workmanship must be pronounced defective; but Mr L'Estrange writes in a kindly, genial spirit, and has probably done his best to preserve the memory of his friend. That object, however, has already been secured more effectually by the prize founded in his name at Cambridge for the study of Shaksperian literature.

From the literary life of Mr Harness there is an easy transition to a biography recently published of some of the objects of his admiration. Mr. Fitzgerald, known as an author of a "Life of Garrick," has extended his contributions to theatrical literature, and now presents us with "An Account of the Kemble Family."

A new biography of "the Kembles" would appear to be rather a work of supererogation, seeing that the world is already provided with the very respectable Lives of John Kemble and Mrs. Siddons by James Boaden, and the Life of Mrs. Siddons by her friend the poet Campbell, to say nothing of divers minor memoirs of the same distinguished personages. Mr. Fitzgerald pleads in excuse for his undertaking the imperfections of his predecessors, and the fact that "stores of new material have come to light—theatrical memoirs, diaries, histories, recollections in profusion." Of genuine new material, however, Mr. Fitzgerald produces little, his volumes being mainly compiled from familiar publications. And he is ungenerous in dwelling on the shortcomings, literary and otherwise, of the biographers to whom he clearly stands much indebted for the substance, if not the very existence of his book. Boaden no doubt is inclined to be pompous and prosy, and Campbell, in this instance, is often affected and inflated, but Mr. Fitzgerald's own style of writing is far from admirable, and he is by no means entitled to plume himself upon his accuracy. Perhaps the best apology for the new production consists in the established conviction that the public will not read old books, or cannot conveniently get them to read. For in some sort the modern system of book-making is, to quote Dr. Johnson, "generated by the corruption of" our circulating libraries. In any case readers anxious for information about the Kemble family and the state of the stage in their period will find much interesting and curious matter in Mr. Fitzgerald's book. It is a compilation and not a very adroit one; rather a scrap-book, indeed, well supplied with cuttings from such authors as Scott, Lamb, Hazlitt, Leigh Hunt, &c. In order to help fill his pages the author has even pressed Sheridan into his service, describing

him as "the ingenious Brinsley," and reprinted at length the hackneyed harangue in Pizarro, beginning, "My brave associates, partners of my toil, my feelings, and my fame." But as Mr. Fitzgerald has never seen any of the Kemble family on the stage, he could only thus report at second-hand as to the merits and peculiarities of their performances, and the selections made from the best criticisms of half a century ago form sufficiently entertaining reading. It is perhaps no great matter that the abundance of these quotations considerably affects the book's claims to novelty and originality.

The author deals almost exclusively with the careers of John Kemble and Mrs. Siddons, and devotes but a few lines to the younger members of the family. He appears throughout as a more severe biographer than in his panegyrical "Life of Garrick." He is, indeed, somewhat censorious, and still possessed with his former subject, is fond of interjecting, "So different to Garrick!" and of instituting comparisons with that actor disparaging to the Kembles. He is at needless pains to rake up the scandalous attacks made upon them by personal enemies and malicious rivals. For these charges there would seem to be, in truth, the very slightest warrant. Kemble followed the fashion of his time and often drank deeply. Mrs. Siddons was inclined to be niggardly, and took heed to be always well paid for her services, having once ascertained their high value. It should be stated, however, that she was much beset by the less fortunate members of her family; that her husband was foolish and extravagant and preyed upon her earnings; and that she was the mother of five children. She died worth 35,000*l*. At the date of his death Kemble was comparatively a poor man. On the whole, both brother and sister seem to have been well entitled to the cordial esteem of their private and public friends not less than to the great fame which attended their theatrical achievements. They gave great lustre to the stage, and raised remarkably the status of their art in universal opinion.

Another actor of the same generation, Charles Mayne Young, is the subject of a biography by his son, Mr. Julian Young. Young professed himself to be a follower of the school of the Kembles, and attained to very considerable reputation in his day. The main facts of his life are briefly told, and Mr. Julian Young, who confesses that he has "no access to playbills or piles of newspapers," is obviously in a disadvantageous position for composing the life of an actor—even though that actor was his father. Accordingly the book, so far as it relates to Charles Mayne Young, is little more than a skeleton memoir. The actor was the son of an eminent London surgeon, who seems to have been a tyrant to his family, and whose shameful and brutal conduct finally drove his sons to seek refuge with a maiden aunt. Charles, who had been educated at Eton and Merchant Taylors' School, became a clerk in a Liverpool firm; but speedily took to the stage, and had great success in playing Douglas at Liverpool. He married a young and interesting actress, who died after a year, in giving birth to the author of this book. In 1807 Charles Young appeared for the first time on the London stage in the character of Hamlet. From that time down to 1832, when he finally retired, he was a steady favourite with the public. He died in 1856, after surviving his wife for fifty years. Kean and Young played together on several occasions, and the rivalry between them when Kean appeared as Othello and Young as Iago was long remembered as an exciting incident in the history of the stage. He was an amiable and unambitious man, and having succeeded in realizing a moderate competence was

content to retire from the stage whilst his fame showed no symptoms of decline.

This biography, though ostensibly the main purport of Mr. Young's book, is however the part in which readers will probably take the smallest interest. Though it presents a pleasing, if slightly sketched portrait, it is eclipsed by many amusing pages in which Mr. Young records his experience as a parish clergyman of many years standing. The elderly rector of a rural parish, our author somewhat resembles the late Mr. Barham—without, however, possessing Ingoldsby's special literary and poetic faculty—in his fondness for genial society, in his keen perception of the humorous, in his industrious chroming of jokes, witticisms, conversations, and anecdotes, with a peculiar inclination towards ghost stories. Upon his opinions concerning Shakspeare, dramatic literature, acting, &c., we are not inclined to lay any particular stress, but many of his stories are excellent. To be sure, several have been told before more than once, and some have been told with superior skill, some are certainly apocryphal, and others are a little too strongly flavoured to suit the niceness of modern tastes in such matters. But in this budget of anecdotes, fables, and gossip, old and new, relative to Scott, Moore, Chalmers, Coleridge, Wordsworth, Croker, Mathews, the third and fourth Georges, Bowles, Beckford, Lockhart, Wellington, Peel, Louis Napoleon, D'Orsay, Dickens, Thackeray, Louis Blanc, Gibson, Constable, and Stanfield (the list might be much extended), the reader must be hard indeed to please who cannot find entertainment. No doubt the book suffers from its copiousness—would benefit greatly by liberal thinning—especially in relation to the rector's foreign travels; but then a work of this kind has to be accepted on the author's own terms or not at all. That Mr. Young will obtain a host of readers is not to be questioned; nor can it be doubted that they will close his pages with sentiments of personal friendliness towards him such as authors with far higher claims to distinction have oftentimes failed to evoke. One feels that it would be pleasant to be one of the parishioners of this genial old-world country parson, strong in his sense of his duties, yet thoroughly informed and cultivated, a treasury of interesting memories, and invariably good-humoured and tender-hearted.

Perhaps it is merely to accidental association of name that makes us turn from Mr. Julian Young's book to the memoir, by Mr. Robert Lytton, of Julian Fane. Mr Julian Fane was one of those men whose early promise was prevented from fulfilling itself by premature death, but whose memory is cherished most warmly by many surviving friends. It would not be easy to mention a more graceful record of cherished memories than this short and touching volume. Mr. Fane was one of the small but distinguished undergraduate club, popularly known as the Cambridge "apostles," which reckons amongst its members many of the most distinguished men of our day. He showed much promise of talent in a poem on the death of Queen Adelaide which won the Chancellor's medal. It was a designed imitation of Lycidas, and showed remarkable skill in catching the tone of the author. Similar powers were afterwards displayed by Mr. Fane in the imitation of Shakspeare's Sonnets, and in translations from Heine's lyrics. Perhaps the power of imitation was developed to too great an extent to give much promise of original excellence; though it may be remembered that some very eminent writers have begun by treading very closely in the footsteps of their predecessors before beating out a music

of their own. Mr. Fane, however, strikes us as showing all the peculiarities of an eminently receptive as distinguished from an originating mind.

After leaving college Mr. Fane adopted for a time the diplomatic profession, and made acquaintance at Vienna with his future biographer. To this intimacy we owe many charming sketches. After being for some time Secretary of Legation at St. Petersburg, he was in 1858 transferred to Vienna, where he seems to have lived as far as possible in retirement; yet we are told he was lavishly hospitable, and that "no man better knew how either to order or appreciate a good dinner." Mr. Bulwer has delightful recollections of his intercourse with his friend at this period:—

"Those lounging, early after-dinner talks in that little bachelor boudoir (of which the memory of Julian Fane so vividly recalls the image to my mind, with its pretty chintzes, and its flowers and its piano, as well as its books and despatch-boxes, and all so fragrant with the fresh fumes of the lightest Turkey tobacco); those talks interspersed with snatches of music and song, or recitations of verse or prose, and broken up so soon in order not to miss the overture to the new opera, or the first act of the new play;—how impossible to fancy any thing of the kind under the solemn smoke of our business-burdened London."

Mr. Fane's own evening began after the play was over; and then, "whoever might be so fortunate as to find him alone in dressing-gown and slippers, at his own fireside, a cigar in his mouth and a book on his knee, was sure to find him in the full perfection of his singular charm." It was probably the variety of his accomplishments and interests which prevented him from making a signal mark in any one direction. Mr. Elwin considers that he "would have stamped his mind on his writings if his profession had not absorbed the pick of his day," and he adds that his extreme delight in the labours of others interfered with his own. "When the hour of leisure arrived he could not resist the fascination of his favourite authors."

In 1863 a severe attack of pleurisy seems to have laid the foundation of future evils. In 1865 he was appointed Secretary of Embassy at Paris, in 1866 he married Lady Adine Cowper, and "never was a marriage more harmoniously assorted or more felicitously complete in the union of two appropriately associated natures." This wedded happiness was of brief duration, for Lady Adine died two years after the marriage, leaving behind her a son and a daughter. Previous to this, in consequence probably of his own precarious health, Mr. Fane had resigned the Secretaryship of Embassy, and the few days left to him were full of sadness. He died in the month of April, 1870, after a period of severe suffering; and it is comforting to read that the mother whose life had been devoted to him, and for whom he always held the deepest love and admiration, was with him to the last. What Julian Fane might have done had his life been spared it is impossible to say; what he did was to gain a warm place in the heart of every one fortunate enough to know him.

Whilst speaking of contemporary men of letters, we may touch briefly upon the "Life and Letters of Hugh Miller"—a man of whom Scotland has a good right to be proud, for he was a genuine growth of the soil, and possessed in high degree many of the manliest qualities of his sturdy countrymen. It is possible, however, for Scotchmen to be a little too proud even of so estimable a person as Hugh Miller; and we may venture to doubt whether his

biographer, Mr. Peter Bayne, has not a little over-estimated the public interest in his life when he presents us with a biography containing close upon 1000 octavo pages. After all, life is limited; and there are things which we must be content to forget. Moreover the biography wants freshness, inasmuch as many of the most interesting facts have been anticipated by Hugh Miller himself, who, with an egotism which is never unamiable, and a certain want of delicacy or at least reticence, which we should not be disposed to blame too severely in a man brought up under circumstances so little favourable to the acquisition of a very refined taste, chose to take the public into his confidence in regard to the history of his courtship. The story of his boyhood is interesting, but has been sufficiently related by himself in his well-known volume called "Schools and Schoolmasters."

Few Englishmen will care to hear much about the controversy which culminated in the disruption of 1843. If any body is anxious for such information he may find a good deal of matter bearing upon the topic in Mr. Bayne's pages. Probably the literary side of Miller's activity will attract more attention; and we may say that, on the whole, Mr. Bayne, though slightly affected with the natural disposition of a biographer to regard his hero as a more unique phenomenon than we should be disposed to admit, is nevertheless in the main not very far from a just estimate of Miller's merits. The style of all his writings is idiomatic, picturesque, and manly. He sees things clearly, and describes what he sees in words that express thought. Miller never deals in conventional phrases, because he never writes except when he has something that he wishes to say. His mind was full and strong; and if his range was narrow, there was the less temptation to dissipate his forces. More than this, perhaps, may be justly said in favour of Miller's prose, which is always good, and sometimes admirable; but when Mr. Bayne praises his verses, his wonted sagacity forsakes him, and we are reminded that the biographer is a Scotchman, and is writing the life of a countryman. Mr. Bayne, perhaps, may know by some happy intuition that "it was within the capacity of Miller to produce reflective and descriptive poetry equal to any in the English language," but it is certain that the poetry published by Miller bears no marks of such possible excellence. Mr. Bayne cannot have considered how far such a statement carries him. It means simply, to quote one name instead of several, that Miller as a poet might, had he pleased, have been in some respects the equal of Wordsworth.

We will conclude our notice by a characteristic passage from the memoir which gives poor Miller's view of himself, which, it may be observed, is not altogether coincident with our own:—

"I recollect that once when the claims of Scotland to honour in the world of intellect were on the carpet, I remarked that at all events the first man of mind for the time being was a Scotchman. 'Who is that, Mr. Bayne?' he asked. My reply was prompt and decisive, 'Thomas Carlyle.' 'Ah, no!' he said, with great deliberation, 'Carlyle is not the greatest living man.' 'Who then?' I inquired. He would not name any one, but repeated, 'Ah, no, Mr. Bayne, Mr. Carlyle is not the greatest.' From something in his manner at the moment the impression was conveyed to me that he would not have been surprised to hear himself named as the greatest of living Scotchmen."

We make a great transition in referring to our next subject—who indeed

has only this much in common with Hugh Miller, that he was of Scotch origin. Lord Dundonald, of whom we speak, was clearly a man of the very highest ability for his profession; but, owing to the unfortunate circumstance that he was born too late, never had an opportunity for winning an historical success quite worthy of his reputation. He was a cool-headed fire-eater, a scientific but dashing cruiser, a modern politician, and a seaman of the old school. He was a hero after the fashion of Plutarch, and forms a link between Nelson's vehement genius and Collingwood's power of careful deliberation. Lord Dundonald's story up to the time of his departure for America is related by himself in his "Autobiography," a work which stands alone in the scanty literature of our navy. The book compiled by the present Lord Dundonald and Mr. Fox Bourne is well, though rather drily written, and based on the best information. Of many interesting details which it gives of Lord Dundonald's extraordinary performances in South America we have room only for a single specimen; it is one of those stories which still make the blood thrill, and which we should never be tired of repeating, if only it had been performed under the English flag. Lord Cochrane—to use the title by which he was then known—had agreed to act against Peru as Commander of the Chilian Fleet, whilst San Martin was to command the army. It was in the course of this campaign that Cochrane executed the most famous of all his South American exploits, the cutting out of the "Esmeralda." The "Esmeralda," of forty-four guns, was the crack Spanish man-of-war in the Pacific. She was lying in Callao Harbour, protected by 300 pieces of artillery on the shore, by a strong boom with chain moorings, and by many gun-boats as well as block-ships. To snatch her out of the middle of all this was a game of snap-dragon entirely in Cochrane's way. Careful calculation carried out with brilliant audacity—this was his regular manner as a naval artist. On the night of the 5th of November, 1820, he assembled his party in fourteen boats, and moved with muffled oars through the darkness towards the doomed frigate. Every detail had been settled beforehand, and she was boarded with a wild spring, at many points at once. The Admiral was wounded at the outset. On boarding by the main chains he was knocked back by the sentry's musket, and fell upon the thole-pin of the boat, which entered his spine and caused him many a year of pain. He gained the deck, and was shot through the thigh, but tied a handkerchief round the place and directed the struggle to its close. His Chilians, like his English, behaved well; the Spaniards, surprised and disheartened, were driven from the deck; and in little more than a quarter of an hour the "Esmeralda" was sailing out of the harbour a prize, while the bewildered garrison fired upon her, killing some of their own countrymen, and hitting even neutral men-of-war in their waters, which slipped their cables and made for sea. "This loss," writes the well-known Captain Basil Hall, who was on the South American station at the time, "was a death-blow to the Spanish naval force in that quarter of the world."

We shall not mention any other of his famous exploits, and we can only think with a sigh that so much of a noble life was embittered by a false accusation and a disgraceful judgment. The end of his story is fresher in the public memory than the events from which we have selected the above incident. He lived for many years afterwards—lived down his old misfortunes, and regained his rank and honours; lived to command a British squadron; lived to become a consecrated figure in the eyes of new generations who

reverenced the laurels that crowned his grey hairs. He died at Kensington on the 31st of October, 1860, at the great age of eighty-five, and was buried in Westminster Abbey, where—

* " . . . the fiery fight is heard no more,
And the storm has ceased to blow."

Lord Dundonald's career was almost coincident in time with that of another man of singular vigour, though of vigour directed into very different channels—the late Lord Brougham. Some theorists may amuse themselves with speculating whether, if they had exchanged places, Brougham on the quarter-deck and Dundonald on the floor of the House of Commons might not have displayed similar character. Without discussing such insoluble problems, we have merely to remark upon Brougham's "Autobiography," the first three volumes of which have appeared, and which illustrates many curious facts in the history of the last century. The following directions to his executor are printed in the introduction:—

"If (writing from memory) I have made mistakes in dates, or in proper names, let such be corrected, but the *Narrative* is to be printed AS I HAVE WRITTEN IT. I alone am answerable for all its statements, faults, and omissions. I will have no Editor employed to alter or re-write what I desire shall be published, as EXCLUSIVELY MY OWN."

And they seem to have been scrupulously obeyed. The editor has extenuated nothing, nor is it to be supposed that he has set down aught in malice. One consequence has been the perpetuation of one or two singular blunders which are plainly due to the decay of the author's memory. Thus, for example, he gives as an example of his boyish precocity, a story which he declares himself to have written at a very early age; and which, had he written it, would undoubtedly have shown a most astonishing capacity. When, however, we discover that it is simply a literal translation of Voltaire's story of "Memnon," our admiration for Lord Brougham's early talent is naturally more or less diminished. Another curious lapse of memory appears in the second volume. There Lord Brougham has printed a letter which came into his possession during the scandalous family quarrels of which the Prince Regent was the centre. Lord Brougham publishes the letter as written by George III. to his son. In fact it is a mere copy of a letter which was written during a similar family quarrel by George II. to Frederick, Prince of Wales, and father of George III. Probably the original had been given to Lord Brougham as a curiosity, and finding it amongst his papers, he not unnaturally forgot that family quarrels had been a failing of the family for more than one generation. In spite of these blunders, which must warn us not to accept with too implicit confidence any statements of facts put forward by Lord Brougham, for which there is no better guarantee than the strength of his memory, he has preserved for us an apparently faithful, and certainly a very curious picture of the manners and customs of a generation now passed away. The combination is curious. When we hear of the quantity of wine Lord Brougham drank over-night, and his Munchausen-like shooting next morning notwithstanding, we no longer wonder at his having written a whole *Edinburgh Review*. But, indeed, the book is full of wonders. Almost the first thing he tells us is that his grandmother had frequently described to him how she met a gentleman some years back who had seen the death of Charles I. Perhaps still more extraordinary and still more characteristic is the astounding calmness with

which he states deliberately and circumstantially that all his ancestors were cowards, traitors, or fools; and that he was the first of the family who had either brains or honesty. This remarkable escape from the family destiny he attributes to his father's marriage with a Celt, whose mother was a Robertson of Strowan. He claims for his grandfather, however, the honour of having been the true hero of a story which has been told of several distinguished corpses who had in life been good company. On the occasion of his funeral the whole *cortége* was drunk, with the Duke of Norfolk at the head of it, and in going from the house to the church, a distance of some three miles, the hearse ran against a bridge, and the coffin was dropped into the Eamont, which ran below. Nobody missed it till the party arrived at the grave, when their confusion may be imagined. The lost coffin, however, was duly recovered, and deposited in the family vault, where Lord Brougham saw it himself, much bruised and battered by the stones at the bottom of the river, Lord Brougham evidently inherited the convivial tastes of his forefathers. During a tour in the Western Islands he and three companions drank twelve bottles of port, and after they had left him he finished another bottle and a half with the exciseman. Next morning he went out shooting, and killed at his first fire two hares at one shot more than a hundred yards off, and directly afterwards brought down a grouse at a still greater distance! At night, he says of his party, "we are uniformly and universally dead drunk."

Much of the first volume is taken up with descriptions of his tours in Scandinavia, Holland, Italy, and Portugal. It is pervaded every where by that amazing energy and that unflinching flow of high spirits to which Lord Brougham owed the length and celebrity of his career. The one thing which came amiss to him—as we may learn from one of the keenest and truest epigrams ever uttered—was law. Had he known a little of that, as Lord Lyndhurst remarked, he would have known a little of every thing. A favourable field for this kind of qualified omniscience was opened by the *Edinburgh Review*; and we meet in these pages with some interesting records of the early history of that once formidable organ.

Most of the early contributors to the *Edinburgh Review* were, however, men of great fecundity. In the first four numbers Sydney Smith wrote eighteen articles, Jeffery sixteen, and Brougham himself no less than twenty-one. In the first twenty numbers he wrote eighty articles. Brougham, indeed, seems to have towered over the rest of his colleagues. He it was who first impressed on the *Review* that decided Whig character which caused Scott to remonstrate with Jeffery; and he it was who wrote the article on Spain which drove Scott from it for ever. Yet of actual literary ability, in the ordinary sense of the term, Brougham possessed but little. His style had neither grace nor vigour; and if he was the "witty Whig" of the *Review*, we are glad we are not obliged to read the contributions of the dull ones. It is clear in fact that Brougham's field was action. His powerful mind enabled him to acquire a certain degree of knowledge upon all subjects with which it was useful to be acquainted. But his element was public life, whether at the Bar or in the House of Commons. He never really shone in any other sphere of activity. It is as counsel for a political prisoner, as leader of parliamentary opposition, as the champion and spokesman of Reform, that he will be remembered by posterity when the productions of his pen are for-

gotten and his judgments from the woollack only quoted to be laughed at. His entrance on political life, with which the present volume concludes, is consequently the most important passage which it presents, and his correspondence with Lord Grey is particularly interesting. We are not told indeed what it was that first recommended him to the notice of the Whig leader. But that is probably not far to seek. A writer in the *Edinburgh Review* who could speak as Brougham spoke on the trial of the Hunts would naturally be regarded as a valuable recruit. So Canning had commended himself to the notice of Mr. Pitt, and so doubtless Brougham was commended to the notice of the Duke of Bedford. Early in the spring of 1810 he took his seat for the duke's borough of Camelford, in Cornwall, which possessed the then very respectable constituency of twenty-five persons. He made his maiden speech in the month of March, on the occasion of Mr. Whitbread's motion for an inquiry into the state of the nation, which, he says, contributed greatly to the defeat of Ministers, who were obliged to accept the motion.

Lord Brougham came into Parliament at a moment very favourable for the display of his abilities. From the death of Mr. Pitt till the turn of the tide in the Peninsula the Tory party were struggling in a slough of despond, and were only saved from being swamped in it by the brute force of a majority. The Convention of Cintra, the Walcheren Expedition, and the campaign of Sir John Moore had brought their military policy into utter contempt; official scandals and State prosecutions had still further weakened them at home. Six months before Brougham's election the only man of genius who belonged to them had retired from the Government. The health of the King was fast failing, and the Prince of Wales had not left his old friends. Lord Grey began to talk of what might happen "in a supposed event," and Mr. Brougham to consider whether he could be of any use. Nor is there much reason to doubt that a general election in the autumn of 1809, or the spring of 1810, would have shaken the Tory party to its centre. Fortunately for them, the last appeal to the people had been in 1807 upon two questions which for more than a quarter of a century had always been answered in the same way—namely, the Royal prerogative, and the Roman Catholic claims. The existing Parliament floated them over the crisis, and before another dissolution came about, all former sources of dissatisfaction had been effaced by the victories of Wellington. But the intervening period offered the best possible stage for the *debut* of an Opposition orator, and Brougham made the most of his opportunities. In little more than ten years from his entry into public life he was leading his party in the House of Commons.

Brougham's first great parliamentary achievement was procuring the repeal of the "Orders in Council." He obtained much credit for this performance, which he always fondly remembered, and was in consequence invited to stand for Liverpool at the general election of 1812. He lost the election, and was for two sessions out of Parliament, after which he obtained a seat for Winchelsea, where he remained for fourteen years.

The interval which elapsed between October, 1812, and July, 1815, was occupied in his professional pursuits; in visiting Paris; in the affairs of the Princess Charlotte and her mother, and in constant correspondence with Lord Grey, who recognized him already as one of their foremost men, on all public questions. Brougham had not been mixed up in the celebrated inquiry called the "Delicate Investigation," got up by the Whigs in 1805, at that

time the Princess's enemies. Consequently he was free from the imputation of having come round to the other side in order to spite the Regent for his desertion of the party. This circumstance may, perhaps, have had something to do with the confidence reposed in him by the two Princesses, nor can it be said that throughout the disgraceful family quarrels which preceded the Princess Charlotte's marriage, and are to be found at length in Miss Knight's autobiography, his advice was deficient in either delicacy or wisdom. Whether as much can be said for his subsequent conduct in 1820 is, perhaps, doubtful. The impression is not weakened by the present volume that the Whig support of Queen Caroline was due as much to party as to chivalry. Sir Walter Scott speaks of "her hot-headed adviser, Harry Brougham," as if he attributed his zeal rather to imprudence than partisanship. It may have been so. But remarkable evidence is supplied by this volume that the author of it was for carrying the obligations of party to lengths which even Burke would have repudiated; and a singularly interesting letter to be found at p. 90, which he wrote to Lord Grey in 1813, on the management of opposition, specially justifies this assertion. But whatever the motive which actuated the Whig party, it detracts nothing at all from the merit of Brougham's defence, described by Sir G. C. Lewis, whose foible was not enthusiasm, as "one of the greatest achievements of legal advocacy known in our history."

Space forbids us to pursue any farther the round of Brougham's political activity. Little light is thrown by these volumes upon most of the intrigues in regard to the changes of Government which preceded the Roman Catholic Emancipation and the Reform Bill Agitation. To speak frankly, we consider this to be a matter of singularly little importance. We cannot imagine that the historians of the future will care very much for the precise details of the complicated quarrels in which Wellington, Peel, Canning, and Grey took part. In that period of our history the importance of individual action had sensibly diminished. The weak side of parliamentary government has always been the opportunity which it affords for those infinitely petty negotiations in which our friends Taper and Tadpole take such infinite delight. The Reform Bill marks the appearance upon the stage of a new force, or rather it indicates the point at which the new force established its supremacy. Henceforward political history is a history of the intellectual and social movements which were taking place amongst the middle and lower classes; and it becomes far more interesting to trace the progress of ideas than to plunge into all the ins and outs of the long contradictory stories told by the various people who were struggling for a share of the good things of office and endeavouring to rise upon the waves of popular favour. Now Lord Brougham, great as was his undeniable energy, and important as were the services which he rendered to the Whig party during the years which immediately preceded and succeeded the close of the revolutionary war, was neither an originator nor even a powerful advocate of new ideas. He could carry on a political campaign with admirable vigour, but he had no power of inspiring men with new faiths. Probably there is no book written by a man of real ability more utterly jejune and unsatisfactory than his work on "Political Philosophy." And therefore he is scarcely likely to maintain the position in history which he gained in contemporary politics. Historians will of course refer to the volumes now published as containing many facts which cannot be omitted in seeking to understand the political events of the period; but when they wish to trace the sources of

the new ideas which were transforming society and bringing about a revolution whose scope and tendency we are not yet in a position to appreciate, they must look elsewhere than to Lord Brougham. We must be content, therefore, to dismiss these volumes with the simple remark that they are as a whole very amusing, and that they are, even on a low estimate, no inconsiderable addition to our knowledge of the events of which Lord Brougham was not only an extensive observer but a considerable part.

From the life of Lord Brougham we might be led by a natural train of association to several other books which have appeared during the past year. We have, for example, from Mr. O'Flanagan a series of lives of the Irish Chancellors. Whenever the political history of Ireland comes to be written, this book will prove to be of great service. Mr. O'Flanagan is a most industrious compiler, and has performed a difficult task with considerable judgment. He has managed to write with comparative impartiality on topics which few Irishmen can treat without charging their work with political colour. That he has tried to exhaust his subject is shown in his taking it up from the year 227, and bringing it down to the death of Lord Plunket in 1854. There is at times something amusing in the sort of reverence and awe with which the author regards the theme on which he has laboured. He evidently considers a Lord Chancellor as a creature of a different order from the common run of his kind. Mr. O'Flanagan seldom dares to criticize his gods. He slurs over their frailties. He delights to tell us of their grandeur and their state in former days—how they looked on the woolsack, how they walked to church attended by long trains of servants, how they bestowed their patronage, and how invariably eloquent they were when making a last speech on being superseded in their functions. The zeal with which Mr. O'Flanagan is inspired never flags. He speaks of the Great Seal in a hushed voice as if it were endowed with mystical qualities. In one respect, Mr. O'Flanagan's system of biography deserves special commendation. As a member of the Irish bar, it would not have been unnatural for him to have complained of the constant importation of English lawyers and their elevation to the woolsack over the heads of the Irish King's Counsel, but very few expressions of irritation escape him on this score.

We will not attempt to follow him in detail, but we may venture to quote one or two curious anecdotes which illustrate his pages. We find, for example, this quaint record of Richard Boyle, Earl of Cork, who, at the age of twenty-two, describes himself as promenading Dublin, and gives his entire fortune in the following inventory—"All my wealth then was 27*l.* 3*s.* in money, with two tokens which my mother had given me—viz. a diamond ring, which I have ever since and still do wear, and a bracelet of gold worth 10*l.*; a taffetty doublet, cut with and upon taffetty; a pair of black velvet breeches, laced; a new Milan fustian suit, laced and cut upon taffetty; two cloaks, competent linen and necessaries, with my rapier and dagger!" Boyle was exceedingly prudent; he made two profitable marriages, and he effected a good bargain with Raleigh for lands in the south of Cork which had been granted by the Crown to Sir Walter. There was a dispute about the sale afterwards on the execution of Raleigh, and Boyle wrote an explanatory letter to his son, in which he mentions that Sir Walter had admitted himself indebted and obliged to him as a benefactor who had supplied him with provisions for the victualing of ships and with ready money to pay his captains; "and," adds Boyle,

"he took his son by the hand, and said unto him, 'You never question the Lord Boyle for any thing that I have sold him, for I do lay my curse upon my wife and children if they ever question any of the purchases his lordship hath made of me, for if he had not bought my Irish land of me, by my fall it would have come to the Crown, and then one Scot or other would have begged it, from whom neither I nor mine would have had any thing for it, or such courtesies as I now have received'" This property is at present the subject of litigation on an important question of right to a several fishery granted or supposed to be granted to Raleigh.

Some readers of the book may be disappointed at the samples of bar-wit preserved by Mr. O'Flanagan; but he is economical of trivialities, we suspect, on account of the sense of grave responsibility which he appears to have experienced throughout his work. We can recommend these volumes as an interesting and valuable contribution to Irish biographical literature.

Whilst dealing with Chancellors, we are naturally led to the Life of the first Lord Shaftesbury, by Mr. W. D. Christie. It is an elaborate attempt to rehabilitate the memory of the man whom Dryden's immortal satire has branded with a sentence of infamy, from which there has been no appeal. Lord Campbell, his latest biographer, accepted Dryden's verdict, and, after his usual fashion, raked together all the scandal which came in his way, applied it in the most uncritical spirit, and supplemented any gaps that were left by audacious impudence. Mr. Christie exposes many instances of his predecessor's blundering with an unsparing hand, and really it is difficult to understand how so able a man as Lord Campbell could ever have permitted himself to write in so reckless a fashion. Lord Macaulay, though of course free from such gross mistakes, is accused by Mr. Christie of misunderstanding Shaftesbury, or at least of unduly heightening the shades in his character for the sake of obtaining picturesque effect. We shall not go into the many complicated controversies of which Shaftesbury's career has been the cause. In our judgment, Mr. Christie has succeeded in removing many misapprehensions, and, in short, has proved that Shaftesbury was a man instead of a monster. Dryden, it is true, admits as much as that, or Dryden would not have been the consummate satirist which he undoubtedly was; but it is more difficult to say whether Dryden's poetry or Mr. Christie's prose give the closest approximation to facts. The difficulty is naturally increased because most of the transactions which it would be necessary to understand are now buried in impenetrable night. We suspect that in many cases a verdict of "Not Proven" ought to be returned, and that the world will have to content itself with remaining in ignorance as to the real character of Shaftesbury. It is true that it has to remain in ignorance of many more important matters. We will content ourselves with briefly noticing that part of Lord Shaftesbury's career which has been most eagerly criticized, and on which Mr. Christie labours most to prove his hero's innocence. The story as represented by Mr. Christie, is this: that on the memorable "Declaration of Indulgence," that is to say, the claim to a dispensing power in the case of Protestant and Roman Catholic dissenters, relieving them from the necessity of complying with the Act of Uniformity, being projected by the King, Shaftesbury at first approved it, on the general principle of toleration, and that afterwards, being informed of the secret treaty of Dover, and of Charles's disposition towards Popery, he retracted his consent and gave the King such other signs of determined hos-

tility to Rome that his Majesty was obliged to get rid of him. Granted that this is a true statement of the facts, the question to be solved is whether Shaftesbury's Protestant zeal was inspired by his conscience or his interest. Sir Walter Scott thinks that Shaftesbury, having given deep offence to the Duke of York, was frightened when he saw the two brothers draw together, and considered that, unless he made friends with the popular party betimes, he might fall between the two stools; and that in accordance with this idea he courted his own disgrace. Mr. Christie's version of the story is not inconsistent with this conjecture. We have not much faith in Lord Shaftesbury's Protestantism. But we have no difficulty in believing that he cordially detested Popery. His alarm for his own safety was probably equally sincere. And coupled with this may have been the secret conviction that Charles and his brother had entered into designs very much beyond their strength, and that in the commotion they were likely to produce, a bold and able man who had got aloof at the right time might find his advantage. Shaftesbury flew at high game; and it was a knowledge of this which gave point to the joke about Cromwell and the crown of England, as it perhaps suggested the report, not noticed by Mr. Christie, that he was a candidate for the crown of Poland. The crown, so the story went, had been sent over to him in a green bag, that he might try it on, and he was pleasantly warned to beware of Colonel Blood.

Once fairly in opposition, Shaftesbury did not the work negligently—to use the language of his new friends. The Popish plot was one stroke of his genius. And then followed his confederation with Essex, Sidney, Russell, and the Duke of Monmouth, whom he seems to have flattered himself he could persuade to act together, divided as they were upon the ultimate end to be attained. Sidney was a Republican, Essex and Russell were only constitutional Reformers; Monmouth, of course, was for himself, and Shaftesbury was for Monmouth, hoping, as Evelyn tells us, to mould him to "his own Platonic fancies." But the ex-Chancellor was no longer what he had been. His "tenement of clay" was yielding to infirmity and age. His temper grew more and more capricious. His powers of dissimulation failed. It seems beyond a doubt that his confederates grew suspicious or tired of him. At last they refused to rise at the concerted moment; and Shaftesbury, with characteristic acuteness seeing the position of affairs, made his escape to Holland in time to avoid their fate. He had frequently, during the Dutch war, exclaimed in the House of Lords, "*Delenda est Carthago.*" "*My Lord,*" said the Dutch magistrate to whom he first addressed himself, "*A Carthagine nostrâ nondum deletâ salutem accipe.*"

Mr. Christie disputes the accuracy of this story, we will not ask with what justice—except indeed that we admit that there is a *primâ facie* presumption against all good stories. Though Mr. Christie has probably attempted to disprove too much, we may commend his book as an interesting contribution to the history of the times.

An elaborate attempt has been made to solve another curious historical problem. Mr. Twisleton, with the help of the well-known expert in handwriting, Mr. Chabot, has attempted to throw a decisive light upon the old problem, Who was the author of "*Junius*"? The book was originally suggested by a story which we may assume to be known to most of those who take any interest in the subject. Some one wrote a letter to a Miss Giles,

enclosing a piece of poetry. It is rendered almost certain by correspondence between Sir Philip Francis and a relation of his in America, that Sir Philip was the author of the poem—the probability of which is confirmed by other circumstances of the case. It has further been said that the writing closely resembles the disguised handwriting of Junius's letters. Starting from this investigation, Mr. Twisleton was led to examine the whole question of the handwriting; and he, with Mr. Chabot's assistance, has produced a book so elaborately illustrated with facsimiles, contributing so large a body of evidence, that probably few people will buy it. To give some notion of the general line of argument, we may give a brief account of one subordinate portion.

The evidence may be divided into two heads. There is, in the first place, the comparison between the disguised hand of Junius and the hands of Sir Philip Francis and the other competitors. Although the subject has been often discussed, it has never received any thing like so elaborate a treatment. Secondly, there is the comparison between the handwritings of Junius and of the anonymous correspondent of Miss Giles. We need not give at length the sufficiently well-known story which renders it highly probable that this correspondent was Sir Philip Francis. Assuming it to be proved that the hand which wrote Junius also wrote the letter to Miss Giles, no reasonable man will doubt that the authorship of the letters is brought home to Francis by a proof which, if not demonstrative, excludes any appreciable doubt. The evidence may also be divided according as some part of it rests upon assertions which may be tested by any body who will take the necessary trouble of verification, and part of it upon the authority of the experts Mr. Chabot and Mr. Netherclift. For the great bulk of readers, indeed, most of the statements must rest in some degree upon authority. Few people are likely to test such statements as the following: a particular form of the letter *r*, it is said, is generally employed both by Junius and Francis when it follows certain vowels. "There are 487 exceptions to this general rule in 1646 instances in Junius and 483 exceptions in 1790 instances in Francis. Of these exceptions 250 in Junius and 225 in Francis occur in the final letters of words." A converse of the rule in question holds when the letter *r* follows the vowel *o*. "Francis has made 8 departures only from this practice in 460 instances and Junius 6 only in 465 instances." We quote this passage as giving some idea of the intricacy and minuteness of the examination. We cannot profess ourselves to have counted up the 1646 instances and marked the 487 exceptions. Any body who likes, however, may test Mr. Chabot's assertions. We shall be content to assume their accuracy. As an example of the opposite case, we may quote a very curious and, if accurately stated, a conclusive piece of evidence put forward with great confidence by Mr. Chabot. In the corrected proofs of some of Junius's letters the dates have been first written, then elaborately erased, and then written over again in the ordinary Junius hand. Now, Mr. Chabot says that the erased dates are in the handwriting of Francis, and were presumably erased in order to substitute the disguised hand. The inference is obvious; but it must be added that, as Mr. Chabot himself states, it requires great skill and care as well as trained experience to detect the handwriting beneath the erasure. We must therefore trust to his word, and we have seen the accuracy of his judgment disputed. In one instance, however, Sir Philip (we use the name, in accordance with the Tichborne precedent, without prejudice) has forgotten to make the erasure; and the similarity to

his ordinary handwriting is in this case so strong as to afford by itself a very powerful presumption.

Returning, however, to the question of the disguised Junius hand, we will give a few examples of the statements made by Mr. Chabot, which are open to verification by all who will inspect the facsimiles given. The letter *r*, for example, is formed both by Junius and Francis in thirteen different ways, and each of these thirteen formations occurs "as nearly as possible in the same proportions in the feigned hand of Junius as in the natural hand of Francis." Again, they use the same forms in the same combinations of letters, an instance of which we have already noticed. Both of them generally form the *r* with its shoulder to the left when it follows the vowel *i*. Both of them make an exception in the case of the particular word "sir." Francis makes the shoulder to the right in ten out of eleven instances in writing that word: and Junius puts the shoulder to the right in thirty-six out of thirty-seven instances. Again, Junius uses the letter *d* in ten different forms, some of which are singular and characteristic. Forms precisely similar to all of these may be found in the writing of Francis. Both of them have peculiar habits in regard to the letter *i*. They have a habit of dwarfing its size, of isolating it in the middle of a word, and of omitting it altogether more frequently than any other letter. Both of them frequently invert it, and both of them diminish the size of the letters *m* and *n* when they follow it, as in the words "him" and "again." We need not give more instances of a comparison which is followed out through nearly every letter in the alphabet. To take a somewhat different case, Junius had a curious habit of placing the capital C, which he generally used as a signature to his letters, between two dashes. Francis has signed fifteen of his letters with his initials only, and on two of these occasions during the appearance of the Junius letters placed the P. F. between the two lines; while the same trick may be detected on three subsequent occasions. Another curious point is brought out by Mr. Chabot. Various peculiarities were adopted by Junius presumably as a disguise; such, for example, as forming the first part of the letter *w* like *n*, instead of *u*. These forms do not appear in Francis's hand previous to the publication of the Junius letters; but he was unable to exclude them after getting into the habit, and accordingly they appear for the most part with more or less frequency in the letters written subsequently to that period.

We confess that we regard the evidence thus adduced as almost conclusive, when taken together with the many other lines of testimony converging in the same direction, and we only wish that we could be confident that all other persons would take the same view and that the question might finally be sent to rest.

From the most vigorous writer we may turn to one of the greatest orators of the eighteenth century. The story of George Whitefield's life is told with considerable literary skill by Mr. Gladstone. It has been given to few human beings to exercise so absolute a sway over the passions of their fellow-creatures. It is curious to run over the list of men who have expressed their admiration for his genius, whilst remaining as far as possible from his opinions. Garrick, whose art was in Whitefield's eyes a crime, was jealous of Whitefield's powers of representation. Franklin was a deist, Chesterfield profoundly indifferent to creeds of all kinds; Bolingbroke and Hume were amongst the keenest antagonists of all religious belief; and yet every

one of these men have left testimonies of their sense of his extraordinary merits. The story of Franklin's forced generosity is well known. Mr. Gladstone tells a similar story of a Scotchman at Glasgow. "An officer who knew Whitefield's influence laid a wager with another who was going to hear him with a prejudiced mind, that he would feel himself obliged to give something, notwithstanding his dislike. The wager was accepted; and the challenged man went to church with empty pockets. But Whitefield so moved his heart that he was fain to borrow from his neighbour, and his bet was lost." Still more extraordinary must have been a sermon in which Whitefield described an old blind man advancing by slow steps towards the edge of a fearful precipice. So vividly was the scene pictured that Lord Chesterfield, who was present, starting up as if to save him, screamed out, "Good God, he is gone!" At another time he was preaching before the seamen of New York,—“When suddenly assuming a nautical air and manner that were irresistible, he thus suddenly broke in with, ‘Well, my boys, we have a clear sky, and are making fine headway over a smooth sea before a light breeze, and we shall soon lose sight of land. But what means this sudden lowering of the heavens, and that dark cloud arising from beneath the western horizon? Hark! Don't you hear distant thunder? Don't you see those flashes of lightning? There is a storm gathering! Every man to his duty! How the waves rise and dash against the ship! The air is dark!—the tempest rages!—our masts are gone!—the ship is on her beam ends! What next!’ This appeal instantly brought the sailors to their feet, with a shout: ‘The long-boat! take to the long boat!’”

It is strange that not a trace remains of this extraordinary charm; and perhaps no more striking instance could be given of the extent to which the power of an orator is independent of his matter, and the product, as we must suppose, of some indefinable graces of voice and manner. Whitefield must have had one of the most marvellous organs ever possessed by a human being. Franklin computed that he could be heard by 20,000 people at once. It is said that he could be heard—we presume not very distinctly—a mile off; and yet, though constantly speaking out of doors, this wondrous voice never lost its flexibility. That Whitefield had claims upon the attention of his audience beyond those of mere oratorical skill is undeniable; and amongst them we may reckon the courage with which, in spite apparently of occasional pangs of physical cowardice, he frequently stood up against brutal mobs. Here is an instance of the kind of attacks to which he was exposed, and which, if they injured him for the time, tended to strengthen his position when met with a courageous spirit.

“The city (Exeter) had a band of ruffians called ‘Church Rabble,’ or ‘The God-damn-me Crew,’ who carried persecution to every length short of death. In 1745, the crew, led by a bailiff, a sexton, a parish clerk, and several tradesmen, and encouraged by many ‘gentlemen,’ who placed themselves in windows to see the obscene sport, abused the Methodists as they would, neither the mayor nor the magistrates interfering to stop them. They kicked the men and subjected them to every abuse and indignity. They rubbed the faces of the women with lamp-black and oil, they beat their breasts with their clenched fists; they stripped them almost naked, then turned the rest of their clothes over their heads, and in that condition kicked or dragged them along the street or rolled them in the gutters or in mud-heaps prepared

for them. To save herself from one of the mob who attempted even worse outrage, one woman leaped from the gallery of the meeting-house to the floor. The riot lasted for hours and in the presence of thousands."

We may include amongst works of a biographical character the two volumes of Pope's correspondence which have been published by Mr. Elwin during the year. This book is in one sense an almost unparalleled literary phenomenon. Mr. Elwin has devoted the labour of years to producing a perfect edition of the poetical ruler of the eighteenth century; it is as carefully and conscientiously done as if it were a labour of love, and yet, the effect of this long familiarity with Pope upon his editor's mind has been to produce—not, as is usual, a spirit of indiscriminatory admiration, but its very contrary. Mr. Elwin apparently feels towards Pope as we may imagine a galley-slave would feel to the companion to whom he had been chained for many years, if one galley-slave were a virtuous philosopher who had got into his awkward position by some unaccountable scrape, and the other a villain of a peculiarly cowardly and contemptible type. Mr. Elwin carries his dislike of Pope into the criticism of his poems. We have seldom read a more curiously inappreciative commentary, though it will be enough here to say that he has prefixed to the "Essay on Man" a prose essay about three times the length of the text, intended to show that Pope's theological and philosophical opinions are lame and confused as if any body ever doubted it! Mr. Elwin, however, has undoubtedly exposed many frailties which Pope's admirers would gladly have disbelieved. He occupied 120 pages of his first volume in proving that Pope had garbled his correspondence, and garbled it in such a way as to injure his friend's memory, and to reflect undeserved credit upon himself, and that he had resorted to a series of the most complete and contemptible intrigues in order to make it appear that the publication of his correspondence was not his own act, but that of piratical publishers. In short, he lied basely and profusely.

Pope, whose taste was almost always correct with regard to literary matters knew quite well that ease and freedom are essential to good letter-writing. He knew well that such compositions ought to be unpremeditated, and that whatever charm they possess should be caught from the feelings of the moment. Again and again he assures his correspondents that he is writing in careless haste, that he does not stay to correct, that his words spring warm from his heart, that his letters are "wretched papers" and "unconsidered trifles;" but these assertions did not always deceive his correspondents (they never deceived Swift), and we now know as a fact, what Johnson and Cowper guessed at without our knowledge, that Pope's letters are manufactured, and that, in the language of Bowles, the ease is laboured and the warmth studied.

The truth is Pope was blinded by his literary vanity. In his eagerness to carry out what Swift shrewdly calls his "schemes of epistolary fame," he resorted to the most pitiful arts; and as the result of all his pains not only disgraced himself as a man, but actually lowered his reputation as an author. The interest of Pope's correspondence is, nevertheless, very great. He was the first man of letters of his day; the most powerful intellect of that time was his friend and correspondent for a quarter of a century; he wrote to and received letters from the principal wits of the town; he was the friend of Atterbury and Arbuthnot, of Bolingbroke and Gay, of Steele and Parnell;

and thus Pope's letters, strained and laboured though they be, present to us in suggestive fragments a picture of the age for which we may look in vain elsewhere. Indeed, the literary history of the period could not be written without a familiar acquaintance with this correspondence, and the large and important additions made to it in Mr. Elwin's "Pope" would be a sufficient reason, even if it were the only one, why this edition of the poet should supersede the editions of Bowles and of Roscoe. We think Mr. Elwin has acted wisely in arranging the letters in classes, instead of placing them in chronological order, so that we can refer at once to the correspondence with Wycherley, with Caryll, or with Swift; and as the editor states the source whence each letter is derived, and explains perplexing allusions in the notes, the reader's path is made smooth. There is a good deal, however, in Pope's share of the correspondence which cannot be explained; for, as Mr. Elwin observes, "he had cultivated the art of using words to conceal his thoughts;" but it is probable that we lose little by our ignorance of the meaning sometimes hidden or supposed to be hidden under a cloud of verbiage.

The characters of many of Pope's correspondents are curiously illustrated in these volumes. We may especially mention Gay, Bolingbroke, and Swift. The last is, in our opinion, by far the ablest letter writer of the party. We conclude by quoting two descriptive sketches of themselves—one by Swift writing to Pope, and the other by Pope writing to Swift.

Swift says:—"I awake so indifferent to every thing which may pass either in the world or my own little domestic, that I hardly think it worth my time to rise, and would certainly lie all day abed if decency and dread of sickness did not drive me thence. . . . I dine *tête-à-tête* five days a week with my old Presbyterian housekeeper whom I call Sir Robert, and so do all my friends and neighbours. I am in my chamber at five, there sit alone till eleven, and then to bed. I write pamphlets and folios merely for amusement, and when they are finished, or I grow weary in the middle, I cast them into the fire, partly out of dislike and chiefly because I know they will signify nothing. I walk much every day and ride once or twice a week, and so you have the whole state of my life."

Here is Pope's account:—"The changes of weather affect me much; otherwise, I want not spirits, except when indigestions prevail. The mornings are my life; in the evenings I am not dead, indeed, but sleep, and am stupid enough. I love reading still better than conversation, but my eyes fail, and at the hours when most people indulge in company I am tired, and find the labour of the past day sufficient to weigh me down; so I hide myself in bed, as a bird in his nest, much about the same time, and rise and chirp the earlier in the morning."

Passing to works on general history, we may first notice Mr. Freeman's "Essays," reprinted from various *Quarterlies*, some of which, we regret to say, must now be numbered amongst the dead. Mr. Freeman has an established reputation even amongst those who are very little acquainted with the works to which he has affixed his name. We are all pretty well acquainted with the severe censor who swoops down inevitably upon any poor scribe who ventures to write erroneous opinions about the Holy Roman Empire, or even to speak of the Great Charles by the time-honoured name of Charlemagne. More than once we have seen something like a page of this work filled with an

elaborate argument to show—not that a writer had made a downright mistake or even an incomplete statement of fact—but that he had used some epithet from which it might be generally inferred that his views of history were not quite so clear and comprehensive as they ought to be. Never, in short, was any man taken with so strong a taste for breaking butterflies upon a wheel as Mr Freeman. And yet we should do wrong to speak of his services lightly. In spite of, or rather on account of his little foibles, Mr Freeman has really and perceptibly raised the general standard of scholarship as applied to history, and has succeeded by diligent iteration in drumming two or three useful pieces of knowledge into the heads of most tolerably educated Englishmen. It is perhaps a pity that so much energy should be allowed to run to waste through anonymous channels, and we are therefore glad that Mr. Freeman has collected into a single volume many scattered essays of real value, many of which would scarcely be accessible but for this judicious revival. They will go far to establish Mr. Freeman's claim to be an authority of almost unequalled weight within the subject which he has made his own. His studies of the history, not merely of this country, but of Europe generally, have been surprisingly wide and accurate. His proficiency in many subsidiary branches is scarcely less remarkable, and when we take into account his manifold labours to which nothing but an unflinching industry could have made him equal, we may safely say that no man in England has done more to spread sound historical knowledge. He has the fault of sneering at that kind of writing which he does not appreciate, and apparently considers that the adjective "philosophical" as prefixed to history comes to much the same thing as superficial or erroneous. And yet Mr Freeman's painful investigation of annals would to our thinking be simply so much labour thrown away were it in fact true that no generalizations could be founded upon it.

In spite of the frequent narrowness produced by this tone of thought, and by the occasional exaggerations into which Mr. Freeman is betrayed by his praiseworthy anxiety to render full justice to certain mediæval times, which results in crediting them with virtues and talents to which, as it seems to us, they can hardly lay claim, his book is one of genuine value, and abounds in true historical reflections of the greatest value and solidity. The last fifteen pages of the essay on Frederick II. are admirable for weighty judgment. The essays on Charles the Bold, and the Franks and the Gauls, may teach a novice more of the true state of Europe before the great settlement of Munster, which more than any thing else made it into the modern Europe of the atlas than he would gather from long and elaborate books. Mr. Freeman has the great merit of writing suggestively, as when he says, for instance, that "the conscious idea of nationality had not [in the thirteenth century] the same effect upon men's minds which it has in our times." In this way, though lack of space prevents him from elaborating the discussion of important differences of conception between past and present, he prevents the reader from passing close to them without becoming aware that they are there.

The year has not been fruitful in historical works, but we may briefly mention Dr. Ihne's History of Rome, which appears in an English as well as in the German edition. It may be asked whether there is room for another Roman History, and whether Mommsen should yet be superseded. We may reply that the two writers take lines sufficiently different to allow space for

both. Mommsen writes for scholars and students: Ihne may be studied with profit by readers who come quite fresh to the subject. He is not so dogmatic as Mommsen, and, in difficult cases, places the evidence on both sides fairly before us and gives us reasons for the views which he adopts. The first volume brings us down to the conquest of Italy, and is concluded with an interesting chapter on the condition of the Romans immediately before their great struggle with Carthage. The second volume is concerned with the Punic wars, and brings us down to the decisive victory of Zama. Ihne treats the subject at much greater length than Mommsen, and does not pass over a single detail.

The Punic wars suggest abundant matter for discussion, and the entire subject in all its bearings seems to us to be admirably treated by Dr. Ihne. During the struggle, no less a question was being debated than one involving the whole future history of Europe. Polybius saw clearly that the conquerors at Zama must of necessity get the complete control of the known world. It has been often said that we have reason for congratulating ourselves on the victory of Rome, inasmuch as the civilization which she was the means of spreading was of a nobler and more vigorous kind than that which we usually associate with the Oriental character of Carthage; but Dr. Ihne reminds us that our knowledge of the Carthaginian mind and modes of government is too contracted to enable us to pronounce a judgment with any reasonable confidence. At all events, Livy and Polybius were perfectly right in attributing an altogether exceptional importance to the contest. The latter historian was of opinion that the rival cities were pretty equally matched in strength and resources. On this point we find Dr. Mommsen and Dr. Ihne in substantial agreement. Both think the advantage was on the whole on the side of Rome. The Carthaginians from first to last occupied much the same position in Africa as we do in India. They remained strangers to the end, and their empire, like that of Austria, was made up of various nationalities which hardly admitted of growth into one people. The Roman State confronted them with a well-defined geographical and ethnographical unity. Romans, Latins, Samnites, and Lucanians were races of the same blood, and could be welded together into a homogeneous material. This Dr. Ihne believes to have been the main cause of Roman superiority. The victory, he says, was won by nerve and sinew rather than by skill and courage. He not inaptly compares it to a fight between two equally matched pugilists, in which the question is, Who can keep his breath longest and remain longest on his legs?

In the last chapter of his second volume Dr. Ihne sums up the general results to Rome of her successful termination of this great war. He points out how some of the worst features of the Roman character now became most offensively prominent. The citizen militia had been turned into a professional soldiery. The door was thus opened to a multitude of sources of moral corruption. Roman generals were apt to degenerate into mere plunderers. They were followed by a legion of contractors and speculative traders, who made haste to be rich at the expense of the unhappy countries which were at their mercy. The treatment of Sicily by Marcellus had already been a disgraceful blot on the Roman name. The "blood and iron" element in the national character was now rendered more hideous by an insatiable greed. Greek culture, which was becoming fashionable, was little better than a

varnish spread over a barbarous surface. Another disastrous effect of the wars by which Rome made herself master of the world was to place a huge mass of pauperism side by side with extravagant wealth. Hannibal's dream of a dreadful serpent which crushed fields and plantations beneath its coils had been fulfilled in the deplorable depopulation of Italy. Nothing can be gloomier than the picture which is presented to us in the concluding chapter of this volume. The reader will find a great deal in it which will help him in understanding the subsequent course of Roman history. It brings together in a very moderate compass and in a very clear form the results of much thought and learning, and fitly concludes a work which, as far as it has been carried, treats a well-worn subject with freshness, and will, we are sure, be welcomed by all scholars and historical students. We ought to add that Dr. Ihne is his own translator, and that his style will be found uniformly agreeable.

We shall content ourselves with mentioning only two other books in this division of our subject, and we place them here because they form a kind of link between works of a historical and those of a philosophical character. Mr John Morley has published a *Study on Voltaire*, written with his usual vigour of style. The view which he takes of the general character of his hero's intellectual influence is the one which will commend itself to the school of positivist writers, with whom Mr. Morley has many points of sympathy. More orthodox persons will, of course, be less satisfied; and yet much that Mr. Morley says would deserve the most respectful attention. In truth, the time has come when Voltaire as a writer should be judged with less prejudice than has hitherto been the case. We do not speak merely of the extraordinary merits of his style, of the services which he rendered to history, or of the vigour with which he opposed the last remnants of religious persecution; even in that direction in which his action has been most bitterly condemned we may at least condemn him without thinking and without holding him up as a kind of unparalleled monster. Nobody indeed will deny that Voltaire attacked the faith of his contemporaries with a reckless coarseness, with a mixture of blasphemy, obscenity, and cynicism at which they had a good right to be revolted. But it must also be added that the kind of religion which excited his wrath was really that very unamiable and frigid phenomenon which satisfied the intellects of men in the eighteenth century without touching their hearts. If his assault was unscrupulous, it at least cleared the path of much pharisaism and hypocrisy, and made room, little as he might have expected such a result, for the revival of a more spiritual form of religion in the present century. Mr. Morley is a rather lenient judge of this portent which so startled our grandfathers. In certain cases this seems to betray him into judgments which certainly strike us as paradoxical. That a special taste for licentious writing was among his hero's most marked characteristics was, we had fancied, a matter on which all his critics were agreed, though some might excuse and some exaggerate the offence. It is a disagreeable subject to touch on; but the plain truth should be told on this as on other matters, if they are alluded to at all. Mr. Morley repudiates the charge altogether. "The fact," he says, "that the greatest man of his time should have written one of the most unseemly poems that exist in any tongue is worth trying to understand. Voltaire, let us remember, had no special turn like Gibbon or Bayle, least of all like the unclean Swift, for extracting a malodorous diversion out of grossness or sensuality. His writings betray no

sort of passion for flying to an indelicacy, nor any of the vapid lasciviousness of some more modern French writers." We can only say it does more credit to the freedom of Mr. Morley's mind from any tendency to pry into these "reserved chambers" of humanity than to his success in sounding the depths of the character which he studies, that he should have formed so superficial a judgment of this portion of it. If ever there was a writer into whose temperament impurity was thoroughly ingrained and branded, it was Voltaire. Gibbon and Bayle, though bad enough, were chaste in comparison, and Swift belongs to quite a different category of offensiveness. M. Léouzon Leduc, in his curious essay on Voltaire's library at St. Petersburg (1867), describes five portfolios of commonplace books and memoranda on all kinds of subjects which are there preserved. One of them, full of extracts, notes, and observations, "contains in addition a great number of verses of which the licentiousness exceeds all imagination. Voltaire certainly lied hard when, in disavowing the editions of the 'Pucelle' which were published under his name, he asserted that he was not capable of writing such things!" Here we have a voluminous and laborious author, in the decline of life, occupying himself with composing and preserving poetry of the Holywell-street order, not to amuse or corrupt others, but simply for the gratification of his own sensual fantasy. The real wonder is, not that so great a man could commit such sins, but that he could habitually commit them without incurring the usual penalty of degrading his style and thoughts to the bestial level. Thanks to the extraordinary versatility of his temperament, he could turn from composition of the lowest order to such as involves the highest exercise of reason or the most delicate play of wit, without the gross taint in any way pervading or communicating itself to the finer elements—a very rare exemption in the case of writers with whom impurity has obtained complete mastery over the imagination. It is scarcely less singular that Mr. Morley should have called in Condorcet as a witness to character on this point.

We will merely add one remark, which is useful to that large class of writers who fancy that clearness and vigour of style come by nature, and that what is laborious to write is likely also to be laborious to read. Upon these matters Mr. Morley bears testimony to the singular painstaking of the most versatile, and, as we might have presumed, most facile of writers:—

"His unrivalled brilliancy of expression blinds us to the extreme and conscientious industry that provided matter. No German could have worked more diligently at the facts; and we may say here, once for all, that if it is often necessary to condemn him for superficiality, this lack of depth never at any time proceeds from want of painstaking. M. Léouzon Leduc, in a paper on Voltaire's library at St. Petersburg, above cited, describes one of his portfolios as containing 'an infinite multitude of memoranda, extracts, transcripts on a variety of subjects connected with his studies.' 'Voltaire,' he adds, 'was a laborious and reflective man: nothing passed before his eyes which did not immediately fix his attention and find a place in his notes. If he was 'universal,' it was because his industry attached itself to every subject. . . . The most indifferent, the most fugitive things had interest for him, and assumed consistency under his observation. Need we be surprised after this at the glory achieved by the man, since to genius, which, according to Buffon, consists in sudden illumination, he joined so abundantly that other kind of genius which Buffon has defined as 'patience'?"

The other book which we mentioned is in some respects a curious contrast to Mr. Morley's "Voltaire," and yet it brings us very near to the leaders of that movement of which Voltaire was the most distinguished leader. Mr. Hunt continues his "History of Religious Thought in England," the second volume of which contains the later divines of the Restoration period and the beginning of the Deist controversy. We may be inclined to regret that Mr. Hunt has condescended to be rather an annalist than an historian. He is simply a reporter of opinions and an analyzer of books; but makes no attempt to give us any explanation of the development of opinion whilst he is tracing some of its most remarkable symptoms.

A history would imply grouping of facts; some attempt in this particular instance to present a coherent and systematic picture of the theological ideas current in England during a given period; some attempt to tell us what were the topics upon which the thinkers of the time employed their intellects and the methods by which they endeavoured to arrive at a solution of the problems presented to them. Such a picture may be formed by the reader himself if he has sufficient memory and patience; but he will not find it prepared for him. Mr. Hunt has simply given us a number of careful analyses of the principal books written during the period he is considering. An abstract is proverbially dull reading, and a whole series of abstracts is inconceivably depressing after a time, even if, as in this case, they are intelligently and carefully performed. So far from there being any effective grouping, it is difficult to discover the principle on which Mr. Hunt has arranged his book. In a general way he roughly follows a chronological order; occasionally he becomes biographical, and puts together all the works of any given author, however distant may be the periods of their publication, and sometimes he follows the order of ideas and puts together all the books bearing upon one particular issue. Thus, for example, the controversy about Toleration and the Trinitarian controversy are followed out as continuous subjects, and towards the end of the volume the Deist controversy naturally absorbs all other topics. Yet Toland is separated from Shaftesbury, Collins, and Tindal by many pages, including accounts of South, Bishop Bull, the theology of the Quakers, and various other subjects. Culverwell, whose "Light of Nature" was published in 1652, precedes Wollaston, whose "Religion of Nature Delineated" appeared in 1722, and next comes Shaftesbury, whose works had appeared from ten to fourteen years earlier than Wollaston's. This is an arrangement by subjects; but in another chapter we have an account of Archbishop Sharp's views on predestination, on the Sabbath, and on the Eucharist, Bishop Kidder's appeal to the Jews, Patrick's theory of the sacraments, Fowler's Platonism, and Stillingfleet's theories of Church unity, all following each other in succession, apparently on mere chronological grounds. We do not, of course, deny that it would be extremely difficult to arrange all these complex subjects in a perfectly clear and consecutive manner; and, equally of course, a writer who almost prides himself on being nothing but an annalist will care comparatively little for a confused effect produced upon the mind of the reader.

In spite of these defects, we have no hesitation in saying that Mr. Hunt's book supplies a real want, and will be found of great use to the future historian of English literature. His own theory seems to be that the principal moral of his book will be that many of the things which are now being said

have been said by many people at an earlier period. There is truth in this; but it also throws light upon some of Mr. Hunt's weaknesses. He is so anxious to mark the coincidences between the theological opinions of different epochs that he fails to insist sufficiently upon the differences. An inexperienced reader who studied his book would probably come to the conclusion that the so-called Deists of the beginning of the eighteenth century were not Deists at all in the offensive sense of that word, but simply very amiable persons, who held much the same doctrines that are characteristic of the Broad Church at the present day. An historian should certainly not forget that there was a great deal of human nature at all periods, but he should also mark not less scrupulously the superficial differences. A traveller who observed that Englishmen were in many respects very like Americans would point out a fact which has occasionally been too much forgotten; but if he thought that Americans were simply transatlantic Englishmen, he would certainly produce a very colourless, and, we fancy, a very inaccurate book; and that is rather the impression which Mr. Hunt's travellings into distant centuries are apt to produce upon us.

Few books have been looked for with so much curiosity and interest as Mr. Jowett's edition of Plato, and few or none will be read with more unmixed pleasure. The long delay in the appearance of the work turns out to have been fortunate, for it has caused the enlargement of its plan from an edition of the "Republic" into a far more comprehensive treatment of Plato's writings and philosophy as a whole. It is understood that, as thus enlarged, Mr. Jowett's scheme includes a translation into English of all Plato's works, an edition of the Greek text of the "Republic" with notes, and a volume of essays as well upon Socrates and Plato as on the earlier Greek philosophers in general. Of this scheme the first part now lies before us in four portly volumes, containing all the authentic dialogues done into English, with an introduction prefixed to each, in which its contents are analyzed and criticisms passed upon its style, character, and doctrines. To publish a translation of Plato's works first and the illustrative essays afterwards may at first sight appear an inversion of the natural order, but we are persuaded that in this case it is the true and wise course. Of all philosophers Plato is perhaps the one whose views least admit of being systematically expounded or apprehended apart from the form in which he has himself chosen to state them. There is a great deal in him to be discussed and commented on, but such discussions have little or no value except to one who is already familiar with the Dialogues themselves. Much—not only of the interest but also of the permanent value of his philosophy—lies in its method: in the Socratic device of analysis by question and answer, in the tentative way in which ideas are put forth, in the intermixture of what moderns commonly consider distinct points of view—the ontological, the ethical, the political.

The translation possesses the great merit of accuracy combined with freedom. There are indeed passages in which we have heard it asserted by scholars of rigid accuracy that the translation is not all that might be desired. As a rule, however, no serious complaint seems to be raised against it on this score, even by the most severe purists. The ease and excellence of the English is unmistakable. Mr. Jowett's long familiarity with Plato, and the thoroughness of his sympathy, have given him the power of, as it were, absorbing Plato's thoughts, and then throwing them out in a pure English

dress as if they had never been expressed in Greek. This merit is specially necessary to a satisfactory translation of Plato. It is the necessary expression of the peculiarities of the mode of reasoning adopted in the immortal Dialogues. The essential method of his philosophy is the acquisition of truth by means of cross-questioning and eliciting the beliefs, which, on his showing, lie already in a half-conscious state in our minds. His dramatic powers enabled him to do this with incomparable liveliness and force; but the form was adopted at least as much for philosophical as for artistic reasons.

To one who already knows the substance of Plato's writings, the chief interest of Mr. Jowett's volumes lies in the introductions which are prefixed to the translation of each dialogue. No systematic exposition or examination of Plato's philosophy as a whole is given; either because Mr. Jowett is reserving this for a subsequent volume, or because, as we partly gather from his way of dealing with Plato generally, he dislikes the notion of treating the Platonic doctrines as a "system" in the modern sense. But in the introductions we find, together with a pretty full analysis of each dialogue, a mass of remarks upon Socrates, Plato, and other early Greek philosophers, of the highest interest and value. They vary greatly in length and in the character of their contents, some are despatched in a page or two, while the introduction to the "Republic" occupies 140, and that to the "Laws" 170 pages. But they are almost uniformly bright, fresh, and sparkling; full of delicate criticism and of reflections which are, in the strict sense of the word, suggestive—reflections which do not so much enunciate a proposition as open up a train of thought, indicate a point of view, put a question which it is perhaps impossible to answer, but not on that account less necessary to ask. It is not every mind which this method will please, for Mr. Jowett in this, like Socrates himself, more frequently points out a path than leads us along it, and is concerned rather to create the spirit in which philosophical problems should be approached, and to state the considerations to be regarded in grappling with them, than to propound a solution of his own, or even to intimate that he has one. But to a mind fitted to profit by it, this method is the most stimulating of all methods, and it is especially fitted to prepare a man for the study of Plato.

Mr. Jowett does not attempt, like many previous writers, to fix the precise order of time of the Platonic dialogues. He distributes them roughly into three periods: the first class comprising those in which little is said about the ideas, and which are thoroughly undogmatic; the second class those in which the ideas begin to take a more prominent position, and which is represented by such works as the "Gorgias" and "Theætetus;" whilst the third includes the works which are distinctly dogmatic, and in which he places, though with some doubt, the "Philebus," and the "Politicus," and, without doubt, "The Laws." Plato, however, in Mr. Jowett's opinion, must not be confined within the four corners of a system; he should be regarded as an inquirer, trying first one direction and then another, dwelling at one moment upon some particular aspect of the truth and then perceiving it to be erroneous or incomplete, and launching into some different line of speculation. To such a method we need not say that the form of dialogue is specially well adapted; and those who have studied Plato most accurately will probably be the first to admit that they have received many new lights as to the dramatic position

of the characters and the illustrations of Athenian life and manners which had escaped them until they had the advantage of Mr. Jowett's company in their studies.

We will confine ourselves to one further remark. It is impossible to study Plato without thinking of the conspicuous figure which comes forward so frequently—we mean the Sophist. Mr. Jowett's view should be compared with that of Grote; and to indicate briefly the view accepted by Mr. Jowett, which strikes us as true and original, we will conclude by quoting the following passage:—

“The Sophist in Plato is the master of the arts of illusion; the charlatan, the foreigner, the prince of *esprits faux*, the hireling who is not a teacher, and who, from whatever point of view he is regarded, is the opposite of the true teacher. He is the ‘evil one,’ the ideal representative of all that Plato most disliked in the moral and intellectual tendencies of his own age, the adversary of the almost equally ideal Socrates. He seems to be always growing in the fancy of Plato, now boastful, now eristic, now clothing himself in rags of philosophy, now more akin to the rhetorician or lawyer, now haranguing, now questioning, until the final appearance in the ‘Politicus’ of his departing shadow in the disguise of a statesman. We are not to suppose that Plato intended by such a description to depict Protagoras, or Gorgias, or even Thrasymachus, who all turn out to be ‘very good sort of people when we know them,’ and all of them part on good terms with Socrates. But he is speaking of a being as imaginary as the wise man of the Stoics, and whose character varies in different dialogues. Like mythology, Greek philosophy has a tendency to personify ideas. And the Sophist is truly a creation of Plato's, in which the falsehood of all mankind is reflected.”—(Introd. to Soph. III. 448.)

From the greatest mind of ancient Greece the transition is easy to the acutest metaphysician of England. Professor Fraser has endeavoured to do for Berkeley pretty much what Mr. Jowett has done for the more splendid reputation of Plato; and Berkeley well deserves the labour which has been expended upon his writings.

Berkeley's is one of the half-dozen superlatively important names in the history of speculative philosophy in Great Britain; and there is no philosopher whose practical career has been more entirely pure, high-minded, and worthy of active admiration. The contribution which he made to the development of speculation may be very shortly described in the turn of the famous Greek simile, by saying that he handed the retrimmed torch from Locke to Hume. Locke, holding experience to be the foundation of knowledge, declared further that Substance or Matter—an underlying substratum beneath the qualities which our senses observe in matter—is the cause and foundation of our perceptions: is, in a word, the foundation of our experience. But, asked Berkeley, what is this substratum or matter underlying the sensible qualities of things? It is an abstract idea, an invention of the philosophic imagination; for what is matter but a number of qualities impressing themselves on our senses; and what knowledge can we have of objects otherwise than in the shape of knowledge of ideas? Locke found causality in matter, Berkeley found it in mind. Then came Hume, who accepted Berkeley's dissolution of matter into a succession of phenomena or ideas in the mind, pursued a similar dissolution of mind into a mere succession

of such ideas, and then consummated the doctrine of Scepticism, or in its new form Positivism, by asking what could come of the hunt after causality in any shape.

Without endeavouring to follow out the interesting speculations which naturally attach themselves to Berkeley's metaphysical speculations, we will briefly remark upon the singular beauty of the life of this great leader of thought, in a century which we are accustomed to characterize as cold, formal, and unheroic. No purer or nobler character is revealed to us in the course of philosophical history. Berkeley's plan of raising a college in the Bermudas was destined to failure; but it remains a splendid proof that in that day there was at least one man of first-rate intellectual eminence with a soul too lofty to join in the vulgar struggle for pelf and patronage, to which so many of his contemporaries were content to sacrifice high abilities. Berkeley was the one thoroughly wise, just, and tolerant bishop in Ireland during the century; and it is a pleasant relief, after living with the politicians of the Bubb-Dodington order, and with ecclesiastics as coarse and unscrupulous as Warburton, to turn to a life passed in the resolute exercise of all the Christian virtues. Pope has paid many graceful compliments, most of them to very unworthy persons; but for once his pen was guided by a true instinct, and set down nothing which might not be confirmed by the coolest observer, when he declared that to Berkeley was given "every virtue under heaven."

Chesterfield, whose career in Ireland was, like Berkeley's, creditable, but, unlike Berkeley's, in striking contrast to the rest of his life, tried to raise the excellent bishop to a place of greater emolument. But Berkeley had made up his mind from the beginning never to change his see. "He had," he said, "very early in life got the world under his feet, and he hoped to trample on it to his latest moments." In 1752 he became anxious to take up his residence at Oxford, and wished to resign his bishopric—a thing so unheard of in those times, that George II. could not reconcile himself to its singularity, and declared that Berkeley should die a bishop in spite of himself, but that he might live where he pleased. So he went to Oxford while still Bishop of Cloyne. The great Butler died in the summer of 1752. In January, 1753, Berkeley followed him to the unknown realms. It was on a Sunday evening, and his wife had been reading to him the sublime verses from the fifteenth chapter of the Epistle to the Corinthians. He made some remarks upon them, and then, as they supposed, fell asleep. It was found in a while that he would wake no more. And this was the soft and touching end of a career of high-thinking and generous action.

Mr. R. H. Hutton has published two volumes of *Essays*, with which we may deal shortly in this connexion. The second of them is devoted to purely literary subjects. Mr. Hutton is one of the most graceful and sympathetic of living critics. There is, indeed, a certain defect in his style, which we know not how better to characterize than by saying, that without being positively effeminate, it perhaps partakes in rather too large a measure of certain feminine qualities of style. He is fond of using italics, or in other words, of endeavouring to supply by type the want of sufficiently clear and masculine thought. His tolerance is commendable, but sometimes verges upon weakness. He is so anxious to look through the eyes of the writer under criticism, that he does not always condemn with sufficient energy

the defects which he feels to exist. And yet, whatever Mr. Hutton's shortcomings, we feel that he not only possesses rare insight, but a remarkable delicacy of expression. Nobody can catch evanescent study of meaning more gracefully than he; and it is a pleasure to follow the series of ingenious comments, by which he endeavours to realize for himself and his readers the characteristic merits of our authors, and especially of our poets. Few living men could deal better with Shelley, for example, than is done in the present volume; our only regret in this respect would be that Mr. Hutton is a little in need of pruning, and probably his essays would have had a greater success if they could have been compressed into a smaller space. Mr. Hutton's second volume, as we have said, is devoted to theological topics: and though we will not discuss the correctness of his opinions, we will briefly indicate his point of view.

Mr. Hutton announces himself as a disciple of Mr. Maurice; he owes much, as he tells us, to "the great living principle of Mr. Maurice's writings," without which, in his judgment, neither the first volume nor a great part of the second could have been written. That principle is defined to be that "all beliefs *about* God are but inadequate intellectual attempts to justify a belief *in* Him, which is never a merely intellectual affirmation, but rather a living act of the spirit by no means confined to those who consciously confess His presence." Hence it follows that dogmatism and scepticism are alike inadequate: dogmatism degrades our conceptions of God; scepticism prevents us from accepting any true belief in God. Guided by this principle, it is the great aim of Mr. Maurice and his disciple to penetrate through the dry external form to the genuine faith which underlies it; and, instead of refuting any theory after the old mode of controversy, to extract from it the essential truth, of which it involves a partial and distorted view. So far we can not only admire Mr. Hutton's sentiment, but we can agree with his theory. It is pleasant to find a sincere believer in Christianity who can see some good even in an atheist. Mr. Hutton, in his essay on "the Hard Church," denounces very properly the spirit which leads such writers as the author of the "Eclipse of Faith" to call infidels fools and knaves, and to browbeat them like a cross-examining counsel. He prefers to regard even the most advanced sceptic as a man undergoing a process of divine education, and even ventures to say that if we had to choose between the alternatives of blotting out, on the one hand, "all public and private worship, properly so called, spurious or genuine, all Churches, all creeds, all Pharisaism, all pure, unconscious devotion;" or, on the other hand, "all unconscious and unconfessed acts of surrender to the divine influence in the heart—all that *might* possibly be connected with purely intellectual atheism"—more injury would be done to true religion in the last case than in the first.

Opinions will of course vary widely as to the success which Mr. Hutton and Mr. Maurice have attained in applying their principle. Some people believe, whilst others deny, that the "Broad Church" is in the right track to obtaining the highest degree of truth to which man can aspire, if it has not already reached it. Without even touching upon so wide a question, we will simply remark that every body must admire Mr. Hutton's liberal and Christian spirit; but some people will look to his mode of dealing with theological difficulties as offering the best chances to the distracted frame of mind so characteristic of the present age of the world, whilst others

will hold that here, as in his literary criticism, Mr. Hutton shows, if we may so express ourselves, a certain want of backbone, and would do better if he did not shrink so instinctively from any thing like a definite statement of opinion.

No such fault will be found with Mr. Froude's "Calvinism." This address, recently delivered at St Andrew's, is admirably written, and full of genuine eloquence applied to questions which all thoughtful men are asking at the present day. Its form, indeed, is historical; but there is throughout a reference to modern problems which can be understood without much skill of interpretation. Mr. Froude inquires what is the true meaning of Calvinism. Why did the doctrine which at the present day is generally denounced as harsh and unreasonable appeal so forcibly to some of the greatest men that ever lived? If, as we are sometimes told, it is an immoral and a slavish creed, why was its first influence to restore the moral law to its rightful pre-eminence, and to sustain the greatest of all revolts against unjust authority? Calvinism, he says, when all other systems have failed, "has borne ever an inflexible front to illusion and mendacity, and has preferred rather to be ground to powder like flint than to bend before violence or melt under encervating temptation." How was this?

The answer, so far as we can summarize Mr Froude's remarks in a very contracted form, would be somewhat to this effect. At all times reasoning men have been perplexed by the dark enigma of the world—by the difficulty of detecting the supreme order and purpose beneath the apparent confusion which lies on the surface. The most superficial observation shows pain and misery inflicted alike upon the wicked and the righteous; and the ever-recurring problems of the origin of evil and the nature of man's responsibility present themselves in various forms to successive generations of mankind. The "better sort of men," however, cling to two primary convictions: the first, "that there is over all things an unsleeping, inflexible, all-ordering, just power;" the second, "that this power governs the world by laws which can be seen in their effects, and on the obedience to which, and on nothing else, human welfare depends." The history of great religious movements* is the history of attempts to put these truths into a form which may practically influence the consciences and aspirations of mankind. For, unluckily, the better sort of men by no means have things their own way. Great reformers arise at intervals when the times are ripe, and pronounce the doom of the falsehoods which have been corrupting society. The intervals are periods of religious decay, during which the formulæ which served to express vital truths are being perverted into the service of error and used as a makeshift compromise between the love of good and of evil. The moral law is superseded by a ceremonial law. Duty comes to mean the observance of certain rites, and is dissociated from its influence upon practical life. This is the essence of idolatry—the formation of a system which would be very pleasant to every body if only it would work. Priests are exalted, and laymen are allowed to gain favour with God while in no way hindered from their ordinary occupations and engagements. Gradually, however, the rule of hypocrisy and mendacity becomes intolerable; and some fresh warfare breaks out against the lies and iniquities that are flourishing in high places.

According to Mr. Froude's view, which, though not explicitly given, is not the less easy to understand, we are even now at a period such as that which

preceded the original birth of Calvinism. The world—we use Mr. Carlyle's phraseology, for Mr. Froude is evidently a disciple of Mr. Carlyle—is full of shams, of mendacity, of neglect of the eternal verities, and of various unpleasant tendencies, for which the vocabulary of our great humorist and satirist affords an ample terminology. We are in need, not, as Mr. Hutton would say, of softening down the old dogmas, so as to meet the wants of modern thought—but of summarily sweeping away those dogmas on to the dustheap; and trusting ourselves to speak out, to say nothing more than we seriously believe, and to say it in the plainest of language. Wild work would be made of all the systems of dogmatic theology, and the vast scaffolding of established creeds, to which most divines attach such surpassing importance. They would vanish away like a dream, and what would be left? Simple negation, or a belief in some residuum of unimpeachably sound doctrine? Would religion itself suffer, or would there be a new religion, purged of all the inferior elements to be found in the old? We do not venture to suggest any answer, but will add, that in any case Mr. Froude's essay may be well studied by the lovers of really admirable English style. Whatever the faults which may be laid to his account by those who disagree with him, there can be little doubt that Mr. Froude is one of our best modern masters of rhetoric; and the critic may perhaps be content to ask no more.

Turning from theology to politics we may first mention Mr. Helps' "Thoughts on Government," which appeared towards the end of the year. Mr. Helps has had a better chance than most men of knowing the inner machinery by which government is carried on in this country. His book has, therefore, the rare merit of a sound substratum of practical experience, instead of resting simply upon wide generalizations made by hasty observers, as is too often the case with books which claim to discuss theories of government. We do not think that Mr. Helps, though a very agreeable writer, is a man of much speculative power. He delights rather to dwell upon the outskirts, and gives us plenty of graceful thoughts expressed in an elegant style, without really penetrating to the heart of a subject. In the book before us he shows much good sense, though he perhaps occasionally falls into the mistake—natural in a man of administrative experience—of attaching a little too much importance to the mere machinery, as compared with the animating principle of politics.

Mr. Helps is a strong believer in the House of Lords, though he proposes certain reforms, including, of course, the favourite device of life peerages. It is better worth notice, that in an exceedingly quiet and indirect way, Mr. Helps leads a careful reader to wonder whether, after all, it is not the House of Commons rather than the supplementary body which needs improvement. In a dozen places he lets it appear how the influence of the House of Commons hinders good work in the departments. Bills are framed, not with a view to effecting their objects in the best way possible, but with a view to the treatment their clauses are likely to meet with among the political parties and sections of parties. A Minister's time is occupied by preparing to answer questions in the House, to an extent that seriously cripples his power of giving a full attention to his more legitimate business. The time of a department is spent just in the same way, not in maturing measures or in seeking how this or that work might be better done, but in preparing masses of returns which mean nothing and come to nothing. All this is no doubt true, and the public suffers for it. Of course, in the old days before '32, the affairs

of the country were very much in the hands of half a dozen leaders on either side, who only harassed one another by questions, motions for returns, and so on, in a legitimate, stately sort of way. That tradition is lost. We have gained much by its loss, while we are weakened by the number of obscure and insignificant rich men who have come into Parliament, not with the single aim of promoting good government, but primarily in order to augment their own local importance, a process much assisted, in lack of Demosthenic thunder, by many questions and many motions for returns and papers. It is obviously of essential importance in popular government that there should be as little hindrance as possible to the exercise of the right of questioning and testing the executive; but Ministers might justly endeavour to secure such personal authority in Parliament as to make the present system of futile interruption to business extremely unpleasant to their tormentors. As personal authority, however, is unhappily too rare a gift to be counted on, one can only hope, with a very modest degree of confidence indeed, that the public opinion of the House will operate. This is a very mild hope, we confess, which may be perhaps compared to a pathetic hope of Mr. Helps's own, that people will see the inexpediency and cruelty of inflicting gratuitous letters on men in office. He enforces his benevolent admonition by a tale of awful warning; how he went one morning into one of the offices, and found the chief's private secretary packing up the private letters which had come by the morning's post. They numbered 108. Another batch would be forwarded in the afternoon. The chief was resting in the country, and this was the sort of rest which his correspondents provided for him.

A contribution of a very different kind to the study of politics comes from the distinguished jurist, Sir Henry Maine. Sir Henry has lately returned from high office in India, where he had singular opportunities for observation, of a kind of which his previous studies fitted him to make the very best use. Since his return he has been appointed to the Corpus Professorship of Jurisprudence recently founded at Oxford, and his present publication contains the first six lectures which he delivered, and which give the fruits of his Eastern experience, as seen by the light of his previous investigations. In India he has had the opportunity of seeing in the village communities the working of social organisms corresponding to those which are presumed to have been the earliest rudiments of European civilization. In the Indian communities, Sir H. Maine had before his eyes the originals of the associations described by Nasse and Von Maurer. He is thus enabled to bring his Eastern observations to bear on many topics of great interest to English historians.

"If," says Sir H. Maine, "we begin with modern English Real Property Law, and by help of its records and of the statutes affecting it trace its history backwards, we come upon a period at which the soil of England was occupied and tilled by separate proprietary societies. Each of these societies is or bears the marks of having been a compact and organically complete assemblage of men occupying a definite area of land. Thus far it resembles the old cultivating communities, but it differs from them by being held together by a variety of subordinate relations to a feudal chief, single or corporate, the lord. I will call the new group the manorial group, and though my words must not be taken as strictly correct, I will say that a group of tenants autocratically governed has succeeded a group of households of which the organization and government were democratic."

But even under these altered circumstances, privileges, notably those of commonage, distinctly savouring of the former order of things, remained comparatively intact, and it is through the persistent invasion of these privileges on the part of the lord, at the expense of the tenants, that Sir H. Maine partially explains the extinction of collective, and the origin of individual property in land among us.

"The encroachments of the lord," he observes, "were in proportion to the want of certainty in the rights of the community. Into the grass land he intruded more than into arable land, and into the waste more than into either. The conclusion suggested to my mind is, that in succeeding to the legislative power of the old community, he was enabled to appropriate to himself such of its rights as were not immediately valuable, and which, in the event of their becoming valuable, required legislative adjustment to settle the mode of enjoying them."

This view is illustrated by a reference to the sturdy survival of "common," "commonable," or "open" fields of "lot meadows" and "lammas lands" more or less in all parts of England, and is rendered antecedently probable by a parallel afforded by the Roman jurisprudence.

"You will remember," Sir H. Maine says, "the class of enjoyable objects which the Roman lawyers call *res nullius*, *res publici usus*, *res omnium* or *universorum*: these it reserves to the entire community or confers on the first taker. But under feudalized law nearly all these objects which are capable of several enjoyment belong to the lord of the manor or to the king. Even prize of war, the most significant of the class, belongs theoretically to the sovereign in the first instance. By a very singular anomaly, which has had important practical results, game is not strictly private property under English law, but the doctrine of the subject is traceable to the later influence of the Roman law."

From these brief specimens our readers may form some estimate of the general tone of Sir H. Maine's work, and will not be inclined to doubt that throughout the book we have the speculations of an eminently acute and cultivated mind conveyed in language unusually felicitous and correct.

We turn to a book which deals with communities of a very different kind with a skill, clearness, and judgment which will bear comparison with Sir H. Maine or any other of the writers with whom we are concerned. Miss C. E. Stephen's book on "The Service of the Poor," has scarcely obtained the notice which it deserves amongst the general public, though its merits have been warmly acknowledged by those who are most capable of forming a judgment. The book is divided into two parts. The first gives a careful and admirable account of some of the principal organizations of which the sisters of mercy are a well-known type. It is in the second part, however, which treats in four excellent chapters, on the wants of the poor, on the interests of charitable women, on the public good, and on the theological questions at issue, that Miss Stephen fairly exhausts the controversy. It is long since we have seen a great question treated in so admirably comprehensive a spirit. Miss Stephen fully enters into the motives of those who are opposed to her, and never permits herself to speak slightly or unsympathizingly of any religious impulse. But she points out with no reserve the weak side of the institutions whose merits she discusses, and in so doing shows a logical power and a comprehensiveness of view which are amply sufficient to prove, if any body

should be disposed to doubt, that the feminine intellect is capable of grappling to excellent effect with some of the most complex problems of the day. To give some idea of the nature of a book which we cannot fully analyze within the necessary limitations of our space, we will try to give a hint of the mode in which she deals with one or two actual facts.

The authoress distributes works of charity into three branches—teaching, nursing, and almsgiving. She fully admits that some species of organization is needful for providing a supply of trained women for each of these departments, and for controlling them afterwards in the discharge of their duties. It is also granted that our existing provision for securing these objects is inadequate, and that it is very desirable to increase it. But, as Miss Stephen says,—

“In any attempt to increase this provision the question must arise whether associations for this purpose should be organized upon a religious or upon a secular basis, applying the word ‘religious’ to ‘an association for charitable purposes, the organization of which rests upon the assumption that works of charity, including teaching, almsgiving, and the care of the sick, are means to an end, that end being the spiritual benefit of the performer or of the object of such works,’ and the word ‘secular’ to ‘an association in which works of charity are considered, as regards the organization of the association, whatever may be the views of its individual members, as ultimate ends, and in which, therefore, the only conditions of admission are such as respect the qualifications of the candidate for the work to be undertaken, and the employment of paid or unpaid agents is considered as a question purely of expediency.”

The manner in which Miss Stephen explains the prejudice in favour of religious associations is peculiarly worthy of remark:—

“The connexion,” she observes, “between religion and charity is so familiar and natural that people are apt to forget that the two are essentially distinct, however intimately they may be related. Hospitals and other asylums for the poor and sick were first established by religious orders, and for a long time were principally in their hands. In France, as we have seen, the legislation by which the management of hospitals and the administration of relief were transferred to secular bodies, retained the services of religious orders as nurses in the hospitals and as official almoners in the employment of the ‘Bureaux de Bienfaisance.’ In England, the religious orders themselves having been suppressed, the governing bodies of hospitals and the administrators of poor-law relief have had no such supply of trained women ready to their hands, but have engaged such nurses and such matrons of workhouses and other subordinates as were needed, in the same way in which a private family engages servants—that is, from hand to mouth. The results having been lately judged unsatisfactory, an attempt is being made to provide a remedy by the re-establishment in various forms of charitable ‘sisterhoods.’ What is the real nature of this remedy, as compared with other means of supplying the demand, and how would it be likely to work in the long run? Why should we introduce or reintroduce the principle of what is technically called ‘the religious life’ into our institutions?”

The answers ordinarily given to these questions may be summed up in two. They are substantially, first, that “religion is required as a guarantee for fidelity in performing works of charity,” and, secondly, that “the

administration of charity ought to be used as an engine for the promotion of religion." The fallacy of both these positions, in the sense in which they are advanced, is satisfactorily exposed by Miss Stephen. But we have not space to follow her any farther. We can but commend the book most earnestly to all who take an interest in the important subjects of which it treats.

We shall now turn to literature of a less ambitious order. The year has not produced any book of travels of first-rate interest. It is curious, however, to remark that the impulse to which the foundation of the Alpine Club was owing, still retains enough vitality to have produced three books within the last year; two of them, at least, have enjoyed a considerable popularity, and suggest that there are still many unfeathered bipeds amongst us, to whom the highest ideal of life is summed up in clambering to the summit of a previously unreachd peak. The most important of the books to which we refer is that which Mr. Whymper has published, under the rather undignified title of "Scrambles amongst the Alps." The book is profusely and most admirably illustrated; and if any body would judge of its excellence in an artistic point of view, he has only to compare the woodcuts in this book with those in any old-fashioned work on Alpine travel. Let him, to select an example at random, put the queer little white hummock which stands for the Combin in the old "Peaks and Passes" beside any of Mr. Whymper's drawings—the "Mont Pelvoux," for example, or the Matterhorn from the summit of the Théodule Pass—and it will be readily admitted, especially by members of the Alpine Club, that if the Alpine Club has done nothing else, it has taught us for the first time really to see the mountains. In fact, however, serious comparison is impossible. The old daubs are mere random indications of certain obtrusive features, which could not well be overlooked. Mr. Whymper's woodcuts seem to bring the genuine Alps before us in all their marvellous beauty and variety of architecture. Not a line is thrown away, or put in at random, and we could almost lay down the correct line of assault of one of the peaks represented, without need of looking at the originals. Still more striking is the force with which particular incidents are brought before us. Look, for example, at Mr. Whymper's fall on the Matterhorn, at the descent of the arête of the Ecrins, at the spring over the bergschrund on the Col de la Pilatte, at the passage of another bergschrund on the Dent Blanche, or at the picture of the cannonade on the Matterhorn. Setting aside the purely artistic merits of the drawing, every Alpine traveller will have memories stirred within him at each of these and at many other cuts, and will be ready at once to exclaim, "That is the very thing!" No one who was not thoroughly familiar with the scenery could have produced such life-like sketches, and it is to be feared that few people will quite appreciate them who have not gone through a similar experience. Even unfortunate outsiders, indeed, may recognize the spirit of the drawing, though it is only too probable—such is the ignorance of the world at large—that they will imagine that there is some exaggeration. To our readers it will be unnecessary to point out the strict fidelity of even minute details. No photograph can possibly recall the dramatic scenes which the traveller delights to remember; and it is delightful to be carried back by so skilful a hand to all the varieties of séracs, crevasses, and knife-edges of rock. If these scenes are fully enjoyable only by the expert, every body may admire such views as the "Fogbow seen from the

Matterhorn," or the thunderstorm amongst the crags of the same mountain. They prove conclusively that Mr. Whymper has a full appreciation of the beauty, as well as of the bare facts, of the scenery to which we are introduced. In short, the value of the book, considered simply from an artistic point of view, is incontestable. No illustrations that we know of Alpine travel will at all bear comparison with Mr. Whymper's, when we once ascend above the snow-line. The accuracy and extent of his knowledge of rock and snow forms is surprising.

Mr. Whymper's letter-press, though scarcely so good as his illustrations, is excellent in its way, and contains the fullest record of those attempts to ascend the Matterhorn which terminated in so fearful a catastrophe.

In the little book called "Hours of Exercise on the Alps," Professor Tyndall has republished a variety of papers which are already more or less familiar to Alpine enthusiasts. It contains accounts of his various assaults upon the Matterhorn, of the ascent of the Weisshorn, of the narrow escape on the Piz Morteratsch, and of a number of minor expeditions; while a few chapters at the end contain some remarks upon the scientific theories of glacier movement with which the professor's name is associated. The general aim of the book, so far as it has any definite aim, may perhaps be defined as an attempt to reproduce the enjoyment which a lover of science and of fine scenery derives from the Alps. Professor Tyndall refers to an essay by Mr. Herbert Spencer as giving the rationale of this particular mode of pleasure. He attributes the greatest part of it, not to the associations of the individual, but to certain "deeper but now vague combinations of states that were organized in the race during barbarous times, when its pleasurable activities were among the mountains, woods, and waters." Hypotheses of this kind are fashionable at the present day, and there is doubtless much truth in them. According to Mr. Spencer, Mr. Tyndall or any other existing person may be regarded as an animated onion. Peel off a few of the outside coats, and we come to the primeval savage; go a little deeper, and we shall find the chimpanzee; and the taste for mountain scenery may be regarded as due to the survival within us of the instincts originally acquired at some of these earlier days. Professor Tyndall accepts this theory in the preface to his book, and expresses his general concurrence in it; and yet we must confess that the book itself appears to be diametrically opposed, if not to the truth of the hypothesis, at least to its being any thing like an exhaustive explanation of the phenomenon under consideration. Professor Tyndall gives us very full and very animated accounts of the emotions excited in him by the sight of the lofty mountains—of sunsets upon eternal snow, or thunderstorms among the giant cliffs. Now, if Mr. Spencer's theory be sound, these emotions should be such as would warm the bosom of a naked savage, even of an anthropoid ape. We do Professor Tyndall very scanty justice in saying that no ape of our acquaintance—and, to be candid, our experience is chiefly limited to the Zoological Gardens—is in the smallest degree capable of sympathizing with his feelings. So far from a savage being open to such impressions, very few civilized human beings below the most educated classes are at all capable of feeling them. Professor Tyndall, for example, is descending the Matterhorn. His mind is carried back by an association of ideas natural in a man of science to the ancient chaos from which it was evolved. He asked whether the "formless fog" which then existed contained "potentially the sadness with which he regarded

the Matterhorn." He plunged into speculations as to the proper definitions of matter and force; and he was naturally led to wonder whether, if we got rid of our present systems of dogmatic theology, we could remain contentedly in absolute indifference to the questions which it treats. These and innumerable other trains of thought are easily suggested to reflective minds among the vast masses indicating the action of gigantic forces by which we are every where surrounded in the Alps. Of course they will lead to very different conclusions in the hands of the theologian, the poet, or the philosopher; but whatever be the particular sentiment aroused, we would venture to ask whether it is such as would have occurred to a chimpanzee? Nothing to our minds could be farther from the truth. Professor Tyndall loves the mountains precisely because he possesses a highly cultivated mind of a type as different as possible from that of the chimpanzee, and because he can therefore look upon no cloud or rock without having an infinite number of associated ideas suggested to him. The higher a man rises in the scale of existence the more sensitive he is to the charms of scenery; and indeed, a genuine love of natural beauty scarcely appears in a rudimentary form till he has risen above the great mass of beings who even now consider themselves to be civilized.

The last of these books of Alpine adventure is Mr. Leslie Stephen's "Playground of Europe." This, like Professor Tyndall's book, is a collection of articles which have appeared in different periodicals. The author has no such exciting adventures to record as fell to the lot of Mr. Whymper; he has not the rare artistic qualities which enable the same gentleman to make his book as interesting to the lover of pictures as to the tourist, nor has he the scientific acquirements which give a charm to Professor Tyndall's pages. The main object of his book, in the absence of these claims upon our attention, appears to be, first, to make a variety of jokes which are supposed to derive piquancy from the incongruity of their situation, where we should have expected a touch of profound feeling, secondly, to tell a great number of his countrymen that he thinks them to be fools and bores; and thirdly, to intersperse a few pages of more serious matter, by way, it may be supposed, of redeeming himself from the charge of levity. If we were disposed to be severe, we should of course adopt the ordinary formula, and say that we were saddened by his jokes and amused by his solemnity. This, however, would not be quite fair. The writing is occasionally not devoid of merit, if it is not up to the higher standard set by some writers on similar subjects. If a gentleman is right in strolling through the Alps, sneering at other travellers, and occasionally, to do him justice, at himself, smoking pipes, drinking beer, and making jokes on the most solemn scenery, and occasionally putting in a claim to good taste, in order to excuse himself for ridiculing the mass of mankind, Mr. Stephen is within the permissible limits. As we learn from his title-page that he has formerly been president of the Alpine Club, we presume that he expresses the sentiments of at least a certain minority of its members. Let us hope that others know better how to pay worthy homage to the mountains which they profess to admire.

From travels of so limited a character we turn to the new edition of "Marco Polo," a book which is creditable in the highest degree both to Colonel Yule, the editor, and to Mr. Murray, the publisher. The two volumes are got up with admirable taste, and the woodcuts fully justify the outlay. Colonel Yule had already given proofs of his capacity for the task by editing a book

called "Cathay and the Way Thither," which was issued by the Hakluyt Society in 1866. It contained a series of mediæval journeys to China, and hence Colonel Yule was qualified to act as introducer to this Herodotus of the middle ages. The book may serve to remind us that some of our most energetic modern discoverers are merely following out routes already opened by predecessors at the distance of several centuries. It is thus that in the "Early Voyages to Terra Australis" issued by that society, we are led back to the times of Henry VIII. for notices of that vast continental island of Australia, the earliest memory of which we have most of us been in the habit of connecting with Captain Cook. It is thus also that in "The World Encompassed by Sir Francis Drake" we find the gold-fields of California, named by him "Nova Albion," referred to by an anticipation of nearly three hundred years. So, likewise, in the present case we have an enthusiastic description by Polo of the highlands of Central Asia, including Budakshan and the Pamir Steppe, which in the present day are offering such keen attractions to geographical exploration. It is only during the last three-and-thirty years, after a lapse of six centuries, that English explorers, beginning with Captain John Wood, of the Indian navy, and ending with the intrepid Heyward, whose premature death we last year deplored, have opened up to our knowledge somewhat more of these little known regions. To persons whose studies have lain in this direction, the new edition of "Marco Polo" will probably be one of the most noteworthy productions of 1871, though, as we need hardly remark, it will be entirely eclipsed in popular estimation by many ephemeral publications, which have not cost one-tenth of the labour, and which do not imply one-hundredth part of the acuteness and research possessed by Colonel Yule.

Another very original and interesting book introduces us to a part of the world which till lately was almost shut out from European observation. We refer to the "Tales of Old Japan," by Mr. Mitford, recently secretary of Legation in Japan. The stories which he has collected are told with abundance of skill, and illustrate the peculiarities of a doomed civilization. They are full of quaint inversions of the order of things which we have learnt to regard as natural and universal, and will probably be found as instructive to serious students as they are amusing to persons in search of a book for a leisure hour. To give some idea of the general character of the book we will give a short abstract of one of the most characteristic stories:—A certain Daimio, Takumi no Kami, is deputed by the Tycoon to receive an envoy of the Mikado. He is to be instructed in the necessary ceremonial by a high official of the Tycoon's court. This official considers the presents bestowed by the Daimio who is to come to school with him as unworthy his consequence, and revenges himself by giving his instruction in such a way as shall make his pupil ridiculous. The Daimio, chafed beyond bearing, makes an attempt on his court tutor's life within the walls of the palace. He fails, but the crime is none the less on that account: it is for the insult to the Sovereign he is to be punished. He is sentenced to *haru kiri*, his property is confiscated, and his family ruined. A devoted retainer vows to avenge him; but as such ideas are so extremely natural that his enemy stands on his guard, he begins by allaying the suspicions of the intended victim. He enters on a course of dissipation unbefitting his years and station, rolls drunken in the streets, and in one of the quaint woodcuts we have a picture of a passer-by insulting his prostrate form;

may, to give a more natural colour to his deceit, he actually divorces his wife, puts away his children, and takes a damsel of the tea-houses to live with him. Meanwhile forty-six of his fellow-retainers, who have associated themselves with him, have made their way to Jeddo and betaken themselves to different callings. As artisans, &c., they gain access to the palace of their enemy, and study the disposition of the rooms, the strength of the garrison and the fastenings. At last arrives the occasion so long waited for. The forty-seven attack; after a desperate fight they remain master of the premises and of the person of their enemy. Then the leader of the band, going down on his knees and addressing the old gentleman very respectfully, makes him the following little speech:—"My lord, we are the retainers of Asano Takumi no Kami. Last year your lordship and our master quarrelled in the palace, and our master was sentenced to *hara kiri*, and his family was ruined. We have come to-night to avenge him, as is the duty of faithful and loyal men. I pray your lordship to acknowledge the justice of our purpose. And now, my lord, we beseech you to perform *hara kiri*. I myself shall have the honour to act as your second, and when, with all humility, I shall have received your lordship's head, it is my intention to lay it as an offering upon the grave of Asano Takumi no Kami." Thus, in consideration of his high rank, remarks the chronicler, the Rônins treated him with the greatest courtesy, and over and over again besought him to perform *hara kiri*. All to no purpose. The old gentleman utterly declined to meet them in the same honourable spirit, and forced them ultimately to become his executioners. They fly from justice, not to save their lives, but to fulfil their vow at their master's tomb. Of course, however much he may admire their devotion, it becomes the duty of each man in authority to arrest them as criminals. But when they come opposite the palace of the Prince of Sendai, the Prince observes to one of his councillors, "The retainers of Takumi no Kami have slain their lord's enemy, and are passing this way; I cannot sufficiently admire their devotion, so, as they must be tired and hungry after their night's work, do you go and invite them to come in here, and set some gruel and a cup of wine before them." They carry the head of their lord's enemy to his grave, and lay it on the tomb as an offering, while the ministers of religion are offering prayers and burning incense. Then the forty-seven, who know the penalty they have incurred, give the priests all their money, that they may perform masses for their souls, and, without attempting escape, await the sentence from Jeddo. All of them are condemned to *hara kiri*. All of them perform it, and are buried round the master they avenged so well. Yet more. A Satsuma arrives in pilgrimage at the sacred shrine. Stooping over the grave of the leader of the forty-seven, he says, "When I saw you lying drunk by the roadside, I knew not that you were plotting to avenge your lord; and, thinking you to be a faithless man, I trampled on you and spat on your face as I passed. And now I have come to ask pardon and offer atonement for the insult of last year." Whereupon he disembowels himself on the spot, and the priests bury him with the Rônins.

It will be sufficient if we mention two other books of travels. Mr. Lyndon has edited an account, written by Mr. Poole, of the Queen Charlotte Islands, whose very name is probably known to few people, and which, though discovered and christened in the last century, have never yet been colonized. Captain Cook is said to have been the first white man to set foot upon them,

and Captain Dixon, in 1787, explored their coast-line, and took formal possession of them in the name of his Government. Mr. Poole is of opinion that these islands might be colonized and their resources turned to account with great profit to the empire. The natives, however, are suspicious and unfriendly, and it would require an organized expedition to effect a permanent settlement amongst them. Moreover, they lie far out of the way, and it is difficult even to land upon them. However, as Mr. Poole describes them as the Eden of the North Pacific, and as abounding especially in minerals and timber, we may presume that either the Americans or ourselves are likely before long to pay serious attention to them.

Mrs. Squier has translated and judiciously annotated a book of travels in Central America written by M. Morelet. He travelled as a naturalist and a lover of the picturesque, and has shown great power in describing the solemn recesses of the virgin forest. He shows an enthusiasm bordering almost upon fanaticism, of which some estimate may be formed from his account of a place called Dolores, which, he says, has left him some of the most pleasing reminiscences of his whole journey. The flora and fauna are exceedingly rich; but the conditions of the climate are such that a man must have a very warm affection for the flora and fauna to find in their charms any compensation for his inevitable sufferings. Near the water-courses the country is pestilential; in the wooded plains bilious fever prevails; in the drier regions diarrhoea is predominant, whilst the moderately elevated grounds produce different forms of pneumonia. Even M. Morelet's enthusiasm was insufficient to reconcile him to the various insects and venomous reptiles which in this favoured country are in the habit, to quote "Martin Chuzzlewit," of "grazing upon the human." Mosquitoes, scorpions, cockroaches, ants, spiders, and other loathsome and offensive animals swarm in this happy region. As a specimen of M. Morelet's style, we will quote his description of the city of Carmen:—

"The streets, bordered with the white and red flowers of the periwinkle, and terminating in the surrounding forests, resemble the avenues of some imperial park, and the irregular paths that cross them and lose themselves in clumps of verdure on either hand, make a strange appeal to the imagination of the stranger, who is constantly tempted to explore the mysterious recesses to which they appear to lead. As one walks along contemplatively, he is suddenly startled by the whizzing flight of the humming-bird. . . . When the sun approaches its zenith, and nature is sunk in silence and repose, the iguana may be surprised, extended on some branch of a tree, where he reposes in a state apparently between sleeping and waking, but his vigilance never abandons him. . . . The streets end only in the forest, which is an impenetrable thicket of thorny trees and vine-like plants with velvety pods, which depend from the branches, and when mature drop their seed on the ground, to spring up again in new luxuriance."

We will now proceed to the poetry and novels which have appeared in the course of the year. Their name, indeed, as we have already indicated, is legion; and we can but pick out one or two of the poems and stories which seem to have the most chance of forming a permanent addition to our literature. Amongst the first must be reckoned poems by some of our established favourites. Mr. Tennyson, who has a kind of official title to precedence, has published, in the *Contemporary Review*, another "Idyll of the King,"

founded on the story of Tristram and Iseult. It is marked by his usual qualities of style, though there are perhaps some signs of flagging interest in the task which he has brought so far, and the story which he has now selected offers a by no means agreeable subject for his pen. Mr. Browning's fertility is unexhausted; he has published two poems, each of them marked in every line with his peculiar mannerism. The first of them, named "Balaustion," is more than usually eccentric in method. It is in substance another telling of the story of "Alcestes, after Euripides;" Mr. Browning has placed it in the mouth of a Greek girl, who is supposed to have witnessed the performance, and carries on a curious running comment, which enables him to indulge in his usual taste for psychological analysis. The other poem is a kind of confession by an imaginary Prince Hohenstiel Schwangau—a name under which is thinly veiled Louis Napoleon. Here, too, Mr. Browning pursues his study of character, and endeavours to reveal to us what, in his opinion, is the explanation of his own conduct which the ex-emperor probably gives to himself. Readers of such poems as "Bishop Blougram's Apology" will have little difficulty in imagining the general tone of a poem which shows all the author's usual subtlety and no small share of his power. Mr. Swinburne, who may, perhaps, be reckoned amongst our poets of established reputation, has published a volume called "Songs before Sunrise"—expressive of the most revolutionary sentiments as to all political and ecclesiastical institutions. It is throughout melodious in the highest degree; generally, too, it shows that beating out of a very small thought into a great many sentences and very fine words which is the poet's besetting sin; but, whatever its faults, we also think that at times he strikes a higher tone than he has ever before reached. We will quote only one verse, which rings in our memory and is at least characteristic of the melody.—

"The doors shall burst asunder,
The hinges shrieking spin,
When Time, whose hand is thunder,
Lays hands upon the pin,

And shoots the bolts reluctant, bidding all men in!"

We prefer, however, to dwell upon a new poet, or at least upon a writer who has been pronounced by many good judges to show more of the poetical fire than any other novice who has recently come before the public. Our own opinion is, that his merits have been estimated a little too highly by the critics who now affect to be supreme judges in all matters of poetical taste. However, as we may very likely be wrong, we will enable our readers to judge for themselves, by quoting two or three of the most characteristic passages from a collection of poetry, which, if it deserves all that has been said of it, should place the author on a very high pedestal, and indeed entitle him to be reckoned as the true successor of Byron. We begin by a prophecy of the future of California.—

"I stand beside the mobile sea;
And sails are spread, and sails are
furl'd
From farthest corners of the world,
And fold like white wings wearily.
Steamships go up, and some go down

In haste, like traders in a town,
And seem to see and beckon all.
Afar at sea some white shapes
flee,
With arms stretch'd like a ghost's to
me,

And cloud-like sails far blown and
 curl'd,
 Then slide down to the under-world.
 As if blown bare in winter's blasts
 Of leaf and limb, tall naked masts
 Are rising from the restless sea,
 So still and desolate and tall,
 I seem to see them gleam and shine
 With clinging drops of dripping brine.
 Broad still brown wings slide here
 and there,
 Thin sea-blue wings wheel every
 where,
 And white wings whistle through the
 air.

I hear a thousand seagulls call

* * * * *

Afar the bright Sierras lie,
 A swaying line of snowy white,
 A fringe of heaven hung in sight,
 Against the blue base of the sky.

I look along each gajung gorge,
 I hear a thousand sounding strokes,
 Like giants rending giant oaks,

Or brawny Vulcan at his forge;
 I see pickaxes flash and slime
 And great wheels whirling in a mine.
 Here winds a thick and yellow thread,
 A moss'd and silver stream instead,
 And trout that leap'd its rippled tide
 Have turn'd upon their sides and
 died.

Lo! when the last pick in the mine
 Is rusting red with idleness,
 And rot yon cabins in the mould,
 And wheels no more croak in distress,
 And tall pines reassert command,
 Sweet bards along this sunset shore
 Their mellow melodies will pour,
 Will charm as chaimers very wise,
 Will strike the harp with master
 hand,
 Will sound until the vaulted skies
 The valour of these men of old—
 The mighty men of 'Forty-nine—
 Will sweetly sing and proudly say,
 Long, long ago there was a day
 When there were giants in the land."

The next passage gives the description of a storm in a Mexican Canyon :

"I lay in my hammock ; the air was
 heavy
 And hot and threatening; the very
 heaven
 Was holding its breath; and bees in
 a bevy
 Hid under my thatch; and birds were
 driven
 In clouds to the rocks in a hurried
 whirr,
 As I peer'd down by the path for her,
 She stood like a bronze bent over the
 river,
 The proud eyes fix'd, the passion
 unspoken,
 When the heavens broke like a great
 dyke broken:
 Then ere I fairly had time to give her
 A shout of warning, a rushing of
 wind
 And the rolling of clouds with a
 deafening din,
 And a darkness that had been black
 to the blind,

Came down as I shouted, 'Come in!
 come in!
 Come under the roof, come up from
 the river,
 As up from a grave—come now, or
 come never!'
 The tassol'd tops of the pines were as
 weeds,
 The red-woods rock'd like to lake-
 side reeds,
 And the world seem'd darken'd and
 drown'd for ever.
 One time in the night as the black
 wind shifted,
 And a flash of lightning stretch'd
 over the stream,
 I seem'd to see her with her brown
 hands lifted—
 Only seem'd to see, as one sees in a
 dream
 With her eyes wide wild and her pale
 lips press'd,
 And the blood from her brow and the
 flood to her breast;

When the flood caught her hair as
the flax in a wheel,
And wheeling and whirling her round
like a reel,
Laugh'd loud her despair, then leapt
long like a steed,

Holding tight to her hair, folding fast
to her heel,
Laughing fierce, leaping far, as if
spurr'd to its speed—"

We will give next a description of the wishes of a returning emigrant.

"I gather'd the gold I had laid in the
earth,
Hid over the door and hid under the
hearth;
Hoarded and hid, as the world went
over,
For the love of a blonde by a sun-
brown'd lover.
And I said to myself, as I set my face
To the east, so far from the desolate
place,
'She has braided her tresses, and
through her tears
Look'd away to the west, for years,
the years
That I have wrought where the sun
tans brown;
She has waked by night, she has
watch'd by day,

She has wept and wonder'd at my
delay,
Alone and in tears, with her head
held down,
Where the ships sail out and the seas
swirl in,
Forgetting to knit and refusing to spin.
She shall lift her head, she shall see
her lover,
She shall hear his voice like a sea
that rushes,
She shall hold his gold in her hands
of snow,
And down on her breast she shall
hide her blushes,
And never a care shall her true heart
know,
While the clods are below or the
clouds are above her."

Our last quotation is the description of a march of filibusters under Walker —

"The trees shook hands high overhead,
And bow'd and intertwined across
The narrow way, while leaves and
moss
And luscious fruit, gold-hued and
red.
Through the cool canopy of green
Let not one sun-shaft pass between.
Birds hung and swung, green-robed
and red,
Or droop'd in curved lines dreamily,
Rainbows reversed from tree to tree,
Or sang low hanging overhead—
Sang low, as if they sang and slept,
Sang faint, like some far waterfall—
And took no note of us at all,
Though ripe nuts crush'd at every
step.

Wild lilies, tall as maidens are,
As sweet of breath as pearly fair,
As fair as faith, as pure as truth,
Fell thick before our every tread
As in a sacrifice to ruth,
And all the air with perfume fill'd
More sweet than ever man distill'd.
The ripen'd fruit a fragrance shed,
And hung in hand-reach overhead,
In nest of blossoms on the shoot,
The bending shoot that bore the
fruit.
How ran the monkeys thro' the leaves!
How rush'd they through, brown clad
and blue,
Like shuttles hurried through and
through
The threads a hasty weaver weaves."

We will venture to notice in conclusion a volume of "Lyrical Poems," published by Mr. F. T. Palgrave, better known as a critic and as editor of the excellent collection of lyrical poetry called "The Golden Treasury," than for

original poetry of his own. The present publication will scarcely lift him from a place amongst the commentators to a place amongst the objects of comment; but there are some sufficiently graceful verses of which the following may serve for a specimen:—

“Their little language the children
Have, on the knee as they sit;
And only those who love them
Can find the key to it.
“The words thereof and the grammar
Perplex the logician’s art;
But the heart goes straight with the meaning,
And the meaning is clear to the heart.
“So thou, my Love, hast a language
That in little says all to me,
But the world cannot guess the sweetness
Which is hidden with Love and thee.”

We conclude our summary of the literary history of the past year by noticing a few novels. The novel which appears to have had the greatest success is called “A Daughter of Heth,” and is the work of a hitherto comparatively unknown author, Mr Black. On the whole we think that it deserves the very warm reception which it has obtained. The writing is remarkably fresh and agreeable, there are many touches of excellent description of scenery, and the heroine who gives her name to the novel, a French girl, born and bred in France, but transplanted early in life to a bleak Scotch manse, is admirably designed and portrayed. The motive of the story is the rivalry excited for this girl between a lad called “The Whaup,” the eldest son of the minister, and a certain Lord Earlshope, a county magnate, who, as we regret to say, is already married to a disreputable and cast-off wife. They manage to break her heart between them; but before that catastrophe is enacted, there are many amusing and sentimental passages. Here is a description of poor Coquette, the pretty French girl, by a sour-faced old serving-man, Andrew, to his wife Leezibeth.—

“‘They jabbared away in their foreign lingo, and I’m thinking it was siccan a language was talked in Solom and Goinorrah. And he was a’ smiles and she was a’ smiles, and they seemed to think nae shame o’ theirselves goin’ through a decent country side. It’s a dispensation, Leezibeth, this hussy coming amang us wi’ her French silks and her satins and her deevlish licence o’ talkin’ like a play actor’ ‘Andrew, my man,’ said Leezibeth, with a touch of spite, ‘she’ll no be the only lang tongue we hae in the parish. And what ails at her talking if ye dmna understand it? As for her silks and satins, the Queen on her throne couldna set them off better.’ ‘Didna I tell ye!’ said Andrew, eagerly; ‘the carnal eye is attracted already. She has cuist her wiles owre ye, Leezibeth. It’s a temptation.’ ‘Will the body be quiet?’ said Leezibeth with rising anger. ‘Deed, Andrew, there’s no much fear o’ my spending siller on finery when ye never see a bawbee without running for an auld stocking to put it in.’”

For the sake of the contrast, here is a description of Coquette’s lover, the Whaup —

“Wattie was depending from the small bridge, his head a short distance

When the flood caught her hair as
 the fax in a wheel,
 And wheeling and whirling her round
 like a reel,
 Laugh'd loud her despair, then leapt
 down like a steed,

Holding tight to her hair, folding fast
 to her heel,
 Laughing fierce, leaping far, as if
 spurr'd to its speed—"

We will give next a description of the wishes of a returning emigrant.

"I gather'd the gold I had laid in the
 earth,
 Hid under the door and hid under the
 hearth;
 Hoarded and hid, as the world went
 over,
 For the love of a blonde by a sun-
 brown'd lover.
 And I said to myself, as I set my face
 To the east, so far from the desolate
 place,
 'She has braided her tresses, and
 through her tears
 Look'd away to the west, for years,
 the years
 That I have wrought where the sun
 turns brown;
 She has waked by night, she has
 watch'd by day,

She has wept and wonder'd at my
 delay,
 Alone and in tears, with her head
 held down,
 Where the ships sail out and the seas
 swirl in,
 Forgetting to knit and refusing to spin,
 She shall lift her head, she shall see
 her lover,
 She shall hear his voice like a sea
 that rushes,
 She shall hold his gold in her hands
 of snow,
 And down on her breast she shall
 hide her blushes,
 And never a care shall her true heart
 know,
 While the clods are below or the
 clouds are above her."

One last quotation is the description of a march of filibusters under
 Washington—

"The trees shook hands high overhead,
 And bow'd and intertwined across
 The narrow way, while leaves and
 most
 And luscious fruit, gold-hued and
 red,
 Through the cool canopy of green
 Let not one sun-shaft pass between.
 Birds hung and swung, green-robed
 and red,
 Or droop'd in curved lines dreamily,
 Rainbows reversed from tree to tree,
 Or sang low hanging overhead—
 Sang low, as if they sang and slept,
 Sang faint, like some far waterfall—
 And took no note of us at all,
 Though ripe nuts crush'd at every
 step.

Wild lilies, tall as maidens are,
 As sweet of breath as pearly fair,
 As fair as faith, as pure as truth,
 Fell thick before our every tread
 As in a sacrifice to ruth,
 And all the air with perfume fill'd
 More sweet than ever man distill'd.
 The ripen'd fruit a fragrance shed,
 And hung in hand-reach overhead,
 In nest of blossoms on the shoot,
 The bending shoot that bore the
 fruit.
 How ran the monkeys thro' the leaves!
 How rush'd they through, brown clad
 and blue,
 Like shuttles hurried through and
 through
 The threads a hasty weaver weaves."

We will venture to notice in conclusion a volume of "Lyrical Poems," published by Mr. F. T. Palgrave, better known as a critic and as editor of the excellent collection of lyrical poetry called "The Golden Treasury," than for

original poetry of his own. The present publication will scarcely lift him from a place amongst the commentators to a place amongst the objects of comment; but there are some sufficiently graceful verses of which the following may serve for a specimen.—

“Their little language the children
Have, on the knee as they sit;
And only those who love them
Can find the key to it.
“The words thereof and the grammar
Perplex the logician’s art;
But the heart goes straight with the meaning,
And the meaning is clear to the heart.
“So thou, my Love, hast a language
That in little says all to me;
But the world cannot guess the sweetness
Which is hidden with Love and thee.”

We conclude our summary of the literary history of the past year by noticing a few novels. The novel which appears to have had the greatest success is called “A Daughter of Heth,” and is the work of a hitherto comparatively unknown author, Mr. Black. On the whole we think that it deserves the very warm reception which it has obtained. The writing is remarkably fresh and agreeable, there are many touches of excellent description of scenery, and the heroine who gives her name to the novel, a French girl, born and bred in France, but transplanted early in life to a bleak Scotch manse, is admirably designed and portrayed. The motive of the story is the rivalry excited for this girl between a lad called “The Whaup,” the eldest son of the minister, and a certain Lord Earlshope, a county magnate, who, as we regret to say, is already married to a disreputable and cast-off wife. They manage to break her heart between them; but before that catastrophe is enacted, there are many amusing and sentimental passages. Here is a description of poor Coquette, the pretty French girl, by a sour-faced old serving-man, Andrew, to his wife Leezibeth —

“They jabbered away in their foreign lingo, and I’m thinking it was siccan a language was talked in Sodom and Gomorrah. And he was a’ smiles and she was a’ smiles, and they seemed to think nae shame o’ theirselves goin’ through a decent country side. It’s a dispensation, Leezibeth, this hussy coming amang us wi’ her French silks and her satins and her deevlish licence o’ talkin’ like a play actor.’ ‘Andrew, my man,’ said Leezibeth, with a touch of spite, ‘she’ll no be the only lang tongue we hae in the parish. And what ails at her talking if ye dinna understand it? As for her silks and satins, the Queen on her throne couldna set them off better.’ ‘Didna I tell ye!’ said Andrew, eagerly; ‘the carnal eye is attracted already. She has cuist her wiles owre ye, Leezibeth. It’s a temptation.’ ‘Will the body be quiet?’ said Leezibeth with rising anger. ‘Deed, Andrew, there’s no much fear o’ my spending siller on finery when ye never see a bawbee without running for an auld stocking to put it in.’”

For the sake of the contrast, here is a description of Coquette’s lover, the Whaup —

“Wattie was dependin’ from the small bridge, his head a short distance

from the water, his feet held close to the parapet by the muscular arm of the Whaup, while one of the other boys had been made an accomplice to the extent of holding on to Wattie's trousers 'Noo, Wattie,' said the Whaup; 'ye maun say a sweer afore ye get up. I'm no jokin', and unless ye be quick ye'll be in the water.' But would Wattie, the paragon of scholars, imperil his soul by uttering a bad word? Surely not. Wattie was resolute. He knew what punishment was held in reserve for swearers, and preferred the colder element 'Wattie,' said the Whaup, 'say a sweer, or ye'll gang into the burn as sure as daith' No, Wattie would rather be a martyr. Whereupon he was lowered a few inches, so that the ripples touched his head. Wattie set up a fearful howl, and his brothers raised him to his former position. 'Now will ye say it?' '*Deevil!*' cried Wattie. 'Let me up! I have said a sweer.' The other lads raised a demoniac shout of triumph over this apostasy. . . . 'Ye maun say a worse sweer, Wattie; Deevil is no bad enough' 'I'll droon first,' said Wattie, whimpering in his distaess; 'and then you'll get your paiks, I'm thinking.' Down went Wattie's head into the burn again, and this time he was raised with his mouth spluttering out the contents it had received 'I'll say what ye like; I'll say what ye like! *D—n!* is that bad enough?' With another unholy shout of derision, Wattie was raised and set on the bridge. 'Noo,' said the Whaup, standing over him, 'let me tell you this, my man. The next time ye gang to my faither and tell a story about any one o' us, or the next time ye say a word against the French lassie, as ye ca' her, do ye ken what I'll do? I'll take ye back to my faither by the lug, and I'll tell him ye were sweerin' like a trooper down by the burn. And every one o' us will testify against ye. Ma certes, man, I'm thinking it will be your turn to consider paiks. My faither has a bonnie switch, Wattie—a braw switch, Wattie, and what think ye he'll dō to his well-behaved son that gangs about the country side sweerin' just like a Kilmarnock carter?' "

Another novel which created a certain amount of attention, is entitled "Episodes of an Obscure Life," and consists of a series of descriptions of life amongst the poor at the East End of London. The stories are told graphically, with a rather too palpable imitation of the manner of Dickens. The narrator assumes the character—we cannot say whether in earnest or merely for the purposes of fiction—of a devoted clergyman, and if the assumption be merely dramatic, it is certainly well sustained. The success of this story prompted the appearance of another collection of anecdotes by the same hand, called "Friends and Acquaintances," which was far from obtaining or deserving the success of its predecessor.

We may notice amongst the novels an ingenious book called "The Coming Race," which described an ideal world, supposed to represent the state of things towards which we are gradually tending. The main feature of this millennium is the extraordinary ascendancy obtained by the women, who, in virtue of their greater sensitiveness, are enabled to exert a new force called "Vril," which is to electricity what electricity is to steam. As in other Utopias, one of our main impressions is that the consummation to which we are all tending is one, which, whatever its other merits, implies a very general and depressing dulness.

George Eliot has commenced a new novel called "Middlemarch," singular in the mode of publication, as it is coming out in five-shilling parts,

instead of the ordinary guinea-and-a-half three volume form, and further remarkable as signaling the return of the distinguished author to that kind of literature in which she won her greatest and most legitimate triumphs. Whether she will be able to renew them is of course a question upon which it would be premature to pronounce, whilst we have only the first instalment of the story. The first part has received high praise from competent critics; but we fear that the general public is inclined to pronounce it rather dull. It ends, however, with a situation such as George Eliot loves to depict, and from which she has on previous occasions extracted very powerful interest, the marriage, namely, of an enthusiastic and high-toned girl with a man whose character is rather enigmatical, but who appears scarcely to deserve the ideal graces with which he has been clad by his wife's imagination. The style strikes us as less flexible and graceful than in the early novels, but the story is full of thought and observation, and we hope that it may realize the anticipations of its most favourable critics.

Mr. Lowell, one of the ablest and most scholarlike of American authors, has published a book called "My Study Windows," which consists of a series of interesting literary essays. Mr Lowell's style, compressed, epigrammatic and clear, is and should be well known to all our readers. There are two charming papers, one called "A Good Word for Winter," and the other "My Garden Acquaintances," in which the writer ingeniously and quaintly combines his love of nature and books. The principal essays however contain careful criticisms of a variety of works. There is a fragment on Mr. Carlyle, whom Mr. Lowell, as it seems to us, generally treats with rather more than due severity.

"Mr. Carlyle's manner is not so well suited to the historian as to the essayist. He is always great in single figures and striking episodes, but there is neither gradation nor continuity. He has extraordinary patience and conscientiousness in the gathering and sifting of his material, but is scornful of commonplace facts and characters; impatient of whatever will not serve for one of his clever sketches or group well in a more elaborate figure-speech. He sees history as it were by flashes of lightning. A single scene, whether a landscape or an interior; a single figure, or a wild mob of men, whatever may be snatched by the eye in that instant of intense imagination, is minutely photographed upon the memory. Every tree and stone, almost every blade of grass; every article of furniture in a room; the attitude or expression, nay, the very buttons and shoe-ties of a principal figure; the gestures of momentary passion in a wild throng; every thing leaps into vision under that sudden glare with a painful distinctness that leaves the retina quivering. The intervals are absolute darkness"

Perhaps the best essay in the volume is one upon Chaucer; and there is another well deserving the attention of students of old English literature, in which he indulges in some very sharp criticism upon modern editors. We will, in conclusion, quote a phrase or two in which Mr Lowell has, after his manner, touched off the characteristics of natural scenery with special felicity.

"The 'Song of the Robin,'" he says, "is rather of the Bloomfield sort, too largely ballasted with prose. His ethics are of the poor Richard school, and the main chance which calls forth his energy is altogether of the belly. . . . He eats with a relishing gulp, not inferior to Dr Johnson's." A crow making

love, and "trying to soften his croak to the proper Saint Preux standard, has something the effect of a Mississippi boatman quoting Tennyson;" and of "Autumn" he writes that he is as great a master of melancholy as Heine, but he is a mere sentimentalist, "a kind of Lamartine whining along the ancestral avenues he has made bare timber of, and begging a contribution from your own savings to keep him in countenance."

We shall conclude by a brief notice of a little book belonging to a class which critics are apt to think beneath their notice. The remarkable qualities however which made "Alice in Wonderland" a delight, not merely to the children for whom it was principally intended, but for children of a larger growth, justifies us in calling attention to a new work by the same author, called "Through the Looking-glass." We will not attempt the invidious task of saying whether it is in all respects equal to its predecessor, but give a couple of quotations, on which our readers may pass such judgment as seems good to them. The first is a nonsense poem, called "Jabberwocky".—

"'Twas brillig, and the slithy toves,
Did gyre and gimble in the
wabe;

All mimsy were the borogoves,
And the mome raths outgrabe.

"Beware the Jabberwock, my son!
The jaws that bite, the claws that
catch:

Beware the Jubjub bird, and shun
The frumious Bandersnatch!

"He took his vorpal sword in hand.
Long time the manxome foe he
sought.

So rested he by the Tumtum tree,
And stood awhile in thought.

"And as in uffish thought he stood,
The Jabberwock, with eyes of
flame,

Came whiffing through the tulgy
wood,
And burred as it came!

"One, two! One, two! And through
and through
The vorpal blade went snicker-
snack!

He left it dead, and with its head
He went galumphing back.

"And hast thou slain the Jabber-
wock?

Come to my arms my beamish boy,
O frabjous day! Callosh! Callay!
He chortled in his joy.

"'Twas brillig, and the slithy toves
Did gyre and gimble in the wabe;
All mimsy were the borogoves,
And the mome raths outgrabe."

And here is a conversation between Alice and a Knight which speaks for itself:—

"'You are sad,' the Knight said in an anxious tone: 'let me sing you a song to comfort you.'

"'Is it very long?' Alice asked, for she had heard a good deal of poetry that day.

"'It's long,' said the Knight, 'but it's very *very* beautiful. Every body that hears me sing it—either it brings the tears into their eyes, or else ——'

"'Or else what?' said Alice, for the Knight had made a sudden pause.

"'Or else it doesn't, you know. The name of the song is called "Haddocks' Eyes."

"'Oh, that's the name of the song, is it?' Alice said, trying to feel interested.

"'No, you don't understand,' the Knight said, looking a little vexed. 'That's what the name is *called*. The name really is "*The Aged Aged Man*."

“‘Then I ought to have said, “That’s what the *song* is called”?’ Alice corrected herself.

“‘No, you oughtn’t: that’s quite another thing! The *song* is called “Ways and Means.” but that’s only what it’s *called*, you know!’”

“‘Well, what *is* the song, then?’ said Alice, who was by this time completely bewildered.

“‘I was coming to that,’ the Knight said ‘The song really *is*, “*A-sitting on a Gate*,” and the tune is my own invention.’”

ART.

ENGLISH art was represented by the usual names this year, and if no new revelation has been made to us of any great painter, we may at least say that the works exhibited were fully up to the average. The Royal Academy has done good service by opening its galleries at Burlington House to an Exhibition of the Ancient Masters, intended to replace that which was formerly provided by the British Institution. Nothing could give us so striking an impression of the vast worth of the art treasures in the possession of private owners in this country as a stroll through the rooms where so inestimable a gallery was temporarily collected. We shall give a short list of some of the more prominent pictures, without attempting to criticize works which are not now seen for the first time. Amongst Venetian painters, Carlo Crevelli was represented by Lady Ashburton’s “St George” and Lord Dudley’s “Christ taken from the Cross;” Mantegna Giambellini’s “Virgin and Saint” was lent by Lady Eastlake, to Giorgione is ascribed “A Lady Professor at Bologna,” and Lord Ashburton’s picture, “La Ruchiesta;” Lord Dudley sent an admirable example of Titian in “Susannah and the Elders;” there was a good Tintoret—a portrait of a Cardinal—besides the splendid Hampton Court picture, “Esther brought before Ahasuerus.” Among the great Venetians we had an admirable picture of the “Last Judgment,” by Fra Angelico; Mr. Fuller Maitland lent a fine Botticelli, “The Nativity,” whilst another of less exceptional excellence was lent by Lady Ashburton. Four small predella subjects by Perugino, and two frames, containing each three Saints, ascribed to Raphael, may be noticed; whilst another example of Raphael in his youth appeared in a “Crucifixion;” a finer picture by the same master was the “Three Graces.” Two fragments, attributed to Leonardo, were lent by Baroness North, and there were some fine specimens of Correggio and Guido. The above very cursory list will be sufficient to indicate the abundant wealth of a most interesting collection.

The Academy Exhibition was enriched this year by the misfortunes of our neighbours, and English artists had the advantage of seeing their works contrasted with some of the performances of their best French rivals. We shall go briefly through the most striking pictures, briefly indicating the most remarkable qualities of the painting. Mr. Millais appeared in great force; his principal picture being a striking group of Moses with his arms supported by Hur and Aaron. The three figures stand out against a flaming sunset, and there is remarkable fire and grandeur in the figures themselves, and splendid force in their painting. Mr. Millais lays little stress on the circumstance upon which most painters are inclined to dwell—the fatigue and constraint of

Moses's arms. The eyes and thoughts of all here are bent in passionate suspense upon the battle. The draperies are composed with great simplicity, and the hands and other exposed flesh parts painted with a realism which produces an amazingly vivid effect. The head of Hur is specially grand, but all the faces are amongst Mr. Millais' noblest productions. Their eyes and nostrils dilated in eagerness, their tossed hair and beards, and their general air of inspired wrath, are not unworthy of the greatest masters. A more familiar example of Mr. Millais' ordinary style is "The Sleepwalker," a girl walking on the edge of a cliff with a wonderful brass candlestick and a vivid representation of a night-gown. The invention is not remarkable, but the night and the stars are indicated with something of true imaginative power. "Yes or No" is a half-length, showing a pretty face, a black silk gown, and a piece of Messrs. Salviati's Venetian glass, and is enjoyable in its way, but not specially dignified or admirable if looked at with poetical eyes.

Mr. Leighton's most important work is a large and striking classical composition, which is celebrated in verses of striking beauty by Mr. Browning in his recent poem of "Balaustion." It represents the struggle between Death and Hercules for Alcestes. The centre is occupied by the bier of Alcestes, connecting two vertical groups, one at the feet of the two supernatural combatants wrestling, the other at the head of young men and maidens looking on horror-stricken. There is a certain want of dramatic interest, and we do not feel excited by any keen sympathy with the actors in the struggle. Mr. Leighton's skies are apt to be rather cold and opaque, and the background of scenery strikes us as being rather pretty than powerful or impressive. In spite of this, the skill of execution is remarkable, and when we look into the drawing of particular groups we can see no cause for any thing but admiring criticism. The drawing of the victorious figure of the wrestling Herakles is brilliant and finished to the last degree; the difficulty of inventing a good Death is mastered, and there is a dignity almost amounting to impressiveness in his livid limbs and heavy black wings, and the vindictive scowl of half-ghostly eyes and brows. Mr. Leighton's second picture of girls gathering pebbles on a beach of the Grecian Archipelago is again almost ruined for us by the colour of the background—a thick colour having the quality of soap or confectionery, and almost absorbing into itself the delicately tinted figures with their fluttering draperies. Each of these by itself, designed with the finest grace and skill, is lovely enough as it bends or walks in the breeze. A third little picture of a modern Rhodian interior, made to serve as the home of an ancient philosopher whom we catch teaching his daughter philosophy, is quite winning and complete in its unambitious manner, with a very masterly piece of drawing in the bent back of the man, and an action of happy *naveté* in the poise of the pupil's lolling leg.

Mr. G. Leslie this year selected his subjects also from classical story, and gives us a graceful picture of Nausicaa and her maidens. We cannot, however, say that he really succeeds in illustrating Homer. The picture really represents Clarissa, or Amelia, or one of his favourite young ladies of the eighteenth century performing a dramatic representation of a scene in Greece, with all the accessories carefully enough arranged, but beside an unmistakable English stream from Devonshire or Surrey, instead of the river where Ulysses landed. The picture, however, is a pleasant one, whatever defects may be discovered in it by an exacting criticism. The execution wants force;

but there is abundant proof of delicate feeling and a general sentiment—as of calm repose in a quiet refuge after the heat of midday exercise is agreeably diffused throughout.

Mr. Poole sends a rather feeble picture from “*Cymbeline*,” in which the absence of trained artistic power is fatal to the proper interpretation of much delicate poetical feeling. Mr. Armitage gave a prophetic picture of French peasants a hundred years hence turning up bones of the victims of last year’s war, carefully drawn and designed. Mr. Poynter sent nothing important in scale, but his two small pieces showed his usual mastery of the art. In one of them we may notice the admirable drawing of a group of black and white ibises, greedily waiting at the feet of a priestess for their portion of what we take to be whitebait. Mr. Mason, whose reputation has been lately increasing, though not more than the rare qualities of his work deserve, sent two small pictures. One of them, called “*Blackberry-gathering*,” was a masterpiece of colour and design, with figures of girls climbing amongst the brambles under the strange mysterious light of a setting sun. Mr. Walker exhibited an ambitious, though it may be doubted whether a perfectly successful attempt in a large figure called “*At the Bar*.” Mr. Walker’s technical method is painfully fidgetty and infirm on this scale, and the spectator must shut his eyes to it in order to appreciate the tragic passion and beauty in the motive of his principal figure. Dignity and subtlety of design Mr. Walker has always got into his figures, but here is an intensity and imagination to which he has not accustomed us—in the dreadful gathering together of the limbs and fidgetting tension of the hands as they play with the sprig of the prison rue—in the hollow, half-defiant and half-despairing stare of eyes dry, fixed wide, and burning, which we can feel rather than see through the ominous twilight of the place. We should be inclined to regard this powerful but unaccomplished piece chiefly as a hint of what Mr. Walker may one day be able to do when he paints with the complete mastery of his art which he bids fair to acquire. No one of our young painters gives greater promise of ultimately attaining a very high level amongst the most poetical of our artists. Mr. Marks sends a picture called “*The Bookworm*,” which was, perhaps, an advance upon any thing which he has yet exhibited; besides the true humour which it indicated, there was a singularly admirable arrangement of colour amongst the strange jumble of stuffed birds, skeletons, books, writing materials, apples, crocuses, and painted glass, by which the quaint student was appropriately surrounded. Mr. Albert Moore exhibited three pictures hung injuriously high, one a life-sized figure of a girl walking on the sea-shore before a strong wind, which blows her dull yellow drapery forward over her head. This is a decorative piece, like all Mr. Moore’s, very beautifully balanced and delicately studied in the pure and large spirit of Greek design, and has not, we think, been surpassed by any thing which he has done in the same kind. But in the other two ornamental figures of “*Battledore*” and “*Shuttlecock*,” tinted a little more strongly and fully than usual with him in pale blue and pale green respectively, the marks of study and balance, almost of mechanical calculation, become, we think, almost oppressive. The actions are fugitive, but the life seems somehow to have been studied and calculated out of them, the throats have a wooden look, and the gesture a lack of lightness. It is impossible to speak with too much respect of the delicacy of Mr. Moore’s aims, and the dignity and science of

his work in its peculiar path; but the charm of these things is a lovely and volatile one, that will resent the fetters of too strict and formulated a practice.

Mr. Barclay sent a very pleasing picture called "The Stairs of Ana Capri," and Mr. I. Armstrong two excellent examples of a restrained but admirably satisfactory style.

We pass to the foreign artists, who this year ornamented our walls, and fully repaid the welcome they received by holding up to our native artists a more finished and scientific style than is common amongst ourselves. People talk about protecting British art; if "protection" is to be understood in the commercial sense, these formidable rivals should be excluded; if "protection" means fostering its vigorous development by the most effective means, no better plan could be devised than that of setting before us the best works of art that can be procured from the whole of Europe.

M. Gérôme, who is for some reason more popular in England than in his own country, sent two pictures—one of them, on a larger scale than he usually adopts, was called "À Vendre," and represented a naked Nubian girl, which, we are afraid, must be counted as rather an exception to the above remarks. We do not wish to see this style of art becoming naturalized in England. It is part of the tact, or one may say of the genius, of modern French art, not only to do gross things delicately, but also to disguise poverty under the semblance of restraint, and give the air of discipline to the fact of neglect. It is pretty clear that M. Gérôme is not above the need of such resource. That he applies it with immense ability it is needless to say, and that under cover of it this picture of the olive and the black skinned slave girls is one of the most striking and, at first sight, most masterly on the walls. In sentiment, it has that immovable composure which, blinking at no spectacle either tragic or licentious, gives to so much of M. Gérôme's work a grim command upon the imagination. In execution, it is equal and polished without pleasantness, although with an unwonted richness of accessories sought in the shape of a large pearl shell and a long-tailed blue and yellow macaw, brilliant enough in themselves but hardly fitting into the scheme of the picture. Less able with his peculiar ability is M. Gérôme's other picture of Cleopatra brought to Cæsar in a carpet; the leathery quality of colour is more conspicuous than ever; the Cæsar is without emotion, and the best figure in the piece is that of the big-limbed black eunuch, who stoops and stretches clumsily in the act of pushing the folds of the carpet clear from about the feet of the lady.

M. Hébert, an artist of great reputation, at present living in Rome, sent a remarkable life-size picture called "The Morning and Evening of Life," with a superbly drawn girl in front, and a crawling old woman in the background. Though not completely satisfactory in execution this was one of the most noteworthy things in the exhibition. Another excellent, but older artist, M. Laugée, who has been driven from Paris to accept of English hospitality for a time, sent a composition of "St. Louis ministering to the Poor." M. Heilbuth, German by origin but Parisian by adoption, sent a pleasant pair of pictures entitled "Spring" and "On the Banks of the Seine." M. Legros, better known in England, sent a picture of remarkable power, called "Chantres Espagnols." We might find fault with the over-sentimentality of the art in some respects, but what is one to say when the main masses are managed with such harmonious power as here, where the red robes of the priests and black cloaks of the

choir-men, the dimly-gilded conclave of the apse and stone-coloured faces of architecture all concur with the solemn and complete expression of the heads and hands; and when the picture, full allowance being made for all that its methods leave on one side, is yet about the most gravely and irresistibly impressive on the walls? M. Legros' other picture was a full-length erect portrait of a country squire at the door of his church, showing just the same power of doing more than other painters in the matter of character and impressiveness, and just the same determination to do it at the least cost.

M. Tadema, the last of our foreign visitors whom we need mention, sent a powerful and dramatic picture of the seizure of the Emperor Claudius, who is being discovered in a hiding-place. The picture is of unmistakable power, but wants unity both pictorial and dramatic. The shivering and ignoble panic of the discovered Claudius is good if somewhat overcharged; but the action of the saluting soldiers and women on the left is wooden, and it seems to us an awkwardness of composition to have left so much bare space between this group and the vertical line of the marble term which stands in the middle of the picture. M. Tadema's other bust-figure in life-size of an Ethiop sentinel of the Pharaohs, with great blue scarabees upon the wall behind him, is quite satisfactory.

We will now turn to the landscapes, in which the year 1871 offered some admirable examples. One of the most remarkable is Mr. Brett's large sea-piece from the Dorsetshire cliffs. The painter represents the vast level floor of the blue channel dancing all over with ripples—we carefully abstain from the inevitable quotation which will suggest itself to all our readers—and has shown a perfectly marvellous skill in following out with the ~~most fidelity~~ every minute item that goes to make up the vast scene. We do not inquire whether a too faithful realism has not caused the poetry to slip, as it were, through his fingers, and whether less painstaking accuracy might not have been compatible with a more imaginative result.

Mr. Millais appeared with quite extraordinary force amongst the landscape-painters this year. His great Scotch scene is in no sense a landscape of sentiment either, selecting or playing upon any dominant chord; but, on the other hand, it well avoids the extreme of unmodulated and unsympathetic elaboration. It is precisely like opening one's window upon the place

“Where the long green reed-beds sway
By the rippled waters grey,”

full of light and atmosphere, and with a serious force, care, and delicacy in the entire execution which can hardly be too much praised. The drift of every thing to the left, before a cold, steady wind, swaying the dark tree-tops of the island in the middle distance, and the great bed of sedge that fills the foreground, gives an harmonious and telling movement; and the sense of space and atmosphere is excellently rendered in the white shower of light that falls upon the bend of ruffled river, and the steel-blue haze that makes the hill-shoulder beyond seem dimmer and more distant than it is. Were it not that the whole piece is uncomposed and literal, one would call it a mistake in composition by which the twisted and straggling root-fibres of a loose stump are introduced into the left-hand corner of the foreground, and break the smooth play of line which we have noticed as distinguishing the picture.

Mr. A. W. Hunt, known as one of the most successful contributors to the

Water-colour Society's Exhibition, sent a very beautiful picture of Loch Marce; whilst a simpler, but still very pleasant picture, was that of "Goring Lock," on the Thames. Mr. Vicat Cole's "Autumn Gold" was a striking contrast to Mr. Millais' "Chill October," and showed admirable talent in depicting a sloping bank of ripened corn, descending between great trees towards a wide sweep of distant country.

Mr. Peter Graham, who became first known by his able picture of the "Highland Spate," sent a work of which it may be said that he has succeeded in painting the very wettest day ever painted in the world, rendering, no doubt with more cleverness than thoroughness, the hopeless drench of nature as one witnesses it upon a Scotch country road, the sky a leaden and lightless grey, with torn films of lower cloud visibly sodden and streaming amid the general blur—roadway, and houses, and horses, and dykes, and one or two desperate passengers, all shining from intensity of soak, and despite the even dulness of the atmosphere, which makes the phenomenon of shining difficult. Some dim brightness of colour is sought or hinted at in a woman's petticoat and its reflection in a road-puddle; some spirit and action in the struggle of a small ostler with the horse he holds by the rein. Another Scottish artist, Mr. Macwhirter, illustrated the climate of his country with a smaller, but perhaps more solidly excellent, rain-scene (404), in this a donkey turned out upon a beech stands in patient dejection with his tail to the wind, while sea and sky are mixed in a dark grey cataclysm of wet.

We can give but a brief notice of a few pictures at the Water-colour Exhibitions. The old Society managed to quarrel with Mr. Burne Jones and Mr. F. W. Burton on a question of propriety, in which it is pretty generally held that the Society showed an extravagant degree of prudery; and the withdrawal of those gentlemen from the Society, together with the temporary absence of Mr. Walker, deprived the exhibition of much of its interest.

Mr. Pinwell's "Away from Town," showed four girls in a meadow, with old red buildings behind it and hot-coloured hills in the background. It manifested a refined sense of beauty and much delicacy of sentiment, but showed, as usual, a deficiency of unity and strength.

Mr. A. B. Houghton sent a picture called "Hiawatha and Minnehaha." The central figure of a woman carrying faggots was ably and even grandly conceived and finished, though it might be objected that it represented rather too elevated a type of beauty for an Indian squaw. The ablest, however, of his contributions was a smaller one, showing a rosy child twisted up in an Oriental shawl, and lying fast asleep on a sofa.

Mr. E. K. Johnson sent a large and serious, but rather stagey attempt at rendering a moonlight effect, and Mr. Lamont a couple of interiors, painted in his usual fashion. The dashing veteran of the Society, Mr. John Gilbert, was never in more unexhausted force than this year. His wild torchlight scene of the entry of Joan of Arc into Orleans is full of those vigorous imaginative motives that proclaim aloud the great historical painter (if only the opportunity for great historical painting had been given), the passion of the conception pushes into the execution and colour, and we have the robes of a bishop, the plated armour of steeds and knight, the rags of the mob, all flung in with astonishing force and bravura, but with just so much of inequality and hasty convention in some of the faces and gestures as belongs to an artist who has never been called to tasks serious enough to exact

severity and selection. This, we think, is distinctly a better picture than the scene from *Henry VIII.* (110), while the *Gal Blas* illustration (19) is again one of its author's brightest and most dignified bits of quiet romance-work.

Mr. A. Hunt, whose works at the Academy we have already noticed, carried away the honours in landscape with an admirable picture from the Bay of Naples. We may also mention Mr. Boyce, Mr. Albert Goodwin, and Mr. G. A. Fripp, all of whom sent contributions excellent of their kind.

At the Institute in Pall Mall, Mr. Linton was, as for the last year or two, the most artistic of figure exhibitors, painting costume and subject-pictures with a touch of poetry and a quiet charm of colour worthy of all commendation. The best piece of expression in his work is the face of the damsel too proudly vexed to turn and look at the visitor who presents himself to her, whom she assumes to be some one unwelcome, but whom we can see to be her lover in disguise. Mr. C. Green's costume-pieces are as brisk and careful in execution as ever. We also notice a promising contributor of the school of Walker—Mr. W. Small, whose picture of sheep in the snow strikes us as a better success than that of a girl in the garden, though the latter too has its excellences both of drawing and colour. Mr. E. H. Fahey had some very workmanlike and excellent studies of tone in walls and slate roofs, making quite the most of his subject in all cases. Mr. Hine was broad and pleasant as usual, with his simply washed Southdown landscapes; and a Mr. Penson, whose name is new to us, contributed a moorland scene in which scanty materials are turned to very effective account.

Before leaving the subject of Art, we should notice that Messrs. Crowe and Cavalcaselle have continued their great work by the publication of two volumes, which, for some mysterious reason, are numbered I. and II., instead of IV. and V. The two volumes recently published continue worthily the task which the authors set before them at the commencement. Had they done no more than collect the scattered documentary evidence already published, but which students had to ferret out in all languages and in all corners of literature, their services would have been great. But in addition to this, a large portion of the testimony embodied in their valuable notes has been drawn from sources accessible only to enthusiasts like themselves. Documents in the possession of old Italian families have been yielded up to their inspection, and we now reap the benefit of the earnestness of the searchers and the generosity of the keepers of these ancient records.

But the merit of the authors by no means ends here. The same examination and comparison of works, whether famous or obscure, in almost numberless churches, galleries, palaces, and private houses has been gone through with a patience and minuteness worthy of all praise. Nor can we regard as time and labour wasted the exhaustive research bestowed upon obscure names belonging to various schools, or upon vanished works, or upon yet existing ones which deserve obscurity. On the contrary, we must be grateful to those who have voluntarily burdened themselves with so unattractive a task. Future writers on art will know how to estimate the results, the uses of which if only negative, are obvious enough. When the entire work is finished—and we trust nothing may interfere with its completion—we shall have before us, in our own language, the fullest body of materials for a history of Italian painting that has as yet been presented to the world. In the searching examination we have alluded to, a keen critical spirit has been sharpened by an

extraordinary amount of accurate technical knowledge, which, if it fail to inspire implicit faith in all the judgments, at least ensures solid respect for the opinions of the authors. And, indeed, it is this profound acquaintance with the practical science of art which gives to their volumes a distinguishing and exceptional value. It is a work of laborious and grave research, not written to amuse the general reader, but to interest and inform the sincere student.

SCIENCE.

IN speaking, as briefly as may be, of the scientific results of the year, we find it necessary as usual to confine ourselves to those investigations which have a more or less popular side to them. As it happens, the year 1871 was remarkably fertile in discussions which may be described as lying on the border-land between scientific and moral speculation, and in which, therefore, men of science obtain a far larger audience than usual. We refer especially to the long controversy which has been excited by the latest developments of Mr. Darwin's theory. It is our duty to maintain an absolute impartiality in regard to such questions. We may, however, say what will be admitted on all hands, that the question raised by Mr. Darwin as to the origin of species marks the precise point at which the theological and scientific modes of thought come into contact. Now the relations between these two currents of opinion is of primary importance, and therefore upon the mode in which divines and philosophers will ultimately reconcile their differences depends in great measure the future of human thought. Religion undoubtedly corresponds to an ineradicable instinct; and we can have no fear that religion itself will permanently suffer from scientific discoveries; it is quite possible, however, that the current religious ideas may be materially modified in conception of the external world changes, and it is therefore well worth while to give some attention to this debatable land in which so many vigorous blows are being exchanged by the contending parties, previous to the final reconciliation which we may confidently anticipate.

The publication of Mr. Darwin's "Descent of Man" marks a kind of epoch in these discussions. We are brought face to face in this book with those difficult problems which previously had only revealed themselves more or less indistinctly on the dim horizon; and the interest which it excited is so far from appearing to us excessive, that we should doubt whether the full importance of the new theories has even yet been appreciated by any but a very small number of competent observers. The Darwinian theories go to the root of psychology; they more or less affect every question concerning the genesis of morals and the origin of societies. They exert especially an influence to which it is impossible to set limits—an influence upon method. Mr. Darwin's work, in short, is one of those rare achievements which effect a transformation throughout the whole range of intellectual effort. We know, with more or less certainty, how profound was the influence of the Newtonian philosophy over the two or three generations which followed its promulgation, and we may confidently expect that a similar influence will be produced on the generation now beginning its work by Mr. Darwin's theory. One comes upon traces of its influence in the most remote and unexpected quarters; in historical, social, and even artistic questions no less than in those which are more directly

in question, we are every where meeting with that series of ideas to which Mr. Darwin has done more than any other man to give prominence.

We shall merely attempt to give a bare outline of Mr. Darwin's argument in his last work, without more than the most cursory glance at the more remote conclusions from his theories, or the difficulties which may be opposed to them. The point, as we need hardly say, which Mr. Darwin seeks to demonstrate is that man is descended from the apes. The main grounds on which he bases his argument may be briefly indicated: first, there is the correspondence in bodily structure between man and other animals; the bones of his skeleton, the muscles, nerves, viscera, and brain correspond; the structure of the tissues and the composition of the blood are similar, men and animals have common parasites. The whole process of reproduction is the same in all mammals. Second, the embryo of man closely resembles the embryos of other mammals, and undergoes a corresponding order of development—the embryos of forms, finally so different, preserving up to a certain period the structure of the common ancestor. Third, man possesses certain rudimentary organs, muscles, and other parts, which can only be explained by the fact of their having been possessed by some forerunner in a perfect and serviceable state. These three sets of facts concur in furnishing reasons for supposing that Man is no more by his descent than a more highly organized form or modification of a pre-existent mammal.

Against all this it has been urged from various sides, that there is some fundamental difference between the faculties of man and those of other animals; and that the distinction, for example, between human reason and animal instinct is one not of degree, but of kind. To this Mr. Darwin replies that the force of the objection depends ultimately on propositions which no one now could seriously assert, namely, that man is the only organic being possessed of mental power, and that his power is of a *wholly different nature* from that of other creatures. So far as the emotional parts of mental constitution go, the emotions of animals are plainly our own; terror, suspicion, courage, good humour, bad humour, revenge, affection—all these moods and turns may be as truly predicated, and in the same sense, of the lower creatures as of the highest. If we turn to the faculties of intelligence, we find in the lower, as in the highest, Memory, Imitation, Curiosity, and the rudiments of Imagination (as shown in their dreams), and even the complex and derivative quality of Reason. For what definition of Reason can we accept that shall banish to the lower region of instinct a multitude of cases in which a snake, a bird, an ape, plainly goes through the processes of experience, observation, pausing, deliberation on experience, forming new resolutions as a consequence?

A great mass of interesting phenomena have been collected by Mr. Darwin in proof of these propositions, but we cannot find room even to hint at them. The argument from the absence of language has again been frequently urged. Mr. Darwin says that it would be a natural consequence of the higher development of the intellectual faculties. Apes do not speak, because their intelligence is not sufficiently advanced. Then language has reacted on the intelligence, as great instruments of intelligence always do, and stimulated that development of which it was at first the product. "The mental powers in some early progenitor of man must have been more highly developed than in any existing ape, before even the most imperfect form of speech could have come into use, but we may confidently believe that the

continued use and advancement of this power would have reacted on the mind by enabling and encouraging it to carry on long trains of thought." Other differences between man and the highest anthropomorphous ape may be in the same way described as differences flowing from the highly advanced faculties of man, and some of them are mainly the result of a highly developed language.

Mr. Darwin next endeavours to explain the modes of physical and intellectual development. Here, of course, the doctrine of natural relation assumes great prominence, and is applied, with Mr. Darwin's usual clearness and fertility of resource, to the explanation of the facts. He then asks, what was the manner of the development of the intellectual faculties? This, again, is to be explained by the action of natural selection. "We can see this in the rudest state of society, the individuals who were the most sagacious, who invented and used the best weapons or traps, and who were best able to defend themselves, would rear the greatest number of offspring. The tribes which included the largest number of men thus endowed would increase in number and supplant other tribes." For the same reason which makes savage nations die out before civilized nations, every new step in the perfection of the intellectual faculties would confer an advantage on those who had been able to make such a step. In the same way with the social qualities. The progenitors of man have acquired them by natural selection, as the lower animals have done; that is to say, "when two tribes of primeval man living in the same country came into competition, if the one tribe included (other circumstances being equal) a greater number of courageous, sympathetic, and faithful members who were always ready to warn each other of danger, to aid and defend each other, this tribe would without doubt succeed best and conquer the other."

Such is a statement of Mr. Darwin's main argument, which, however, takes up a comparatively small part of his book. The bulk of the two volumes before us is occupied with the establishment of a different theory. Mr. Darwin holds that the difference between races are due in some measure to what he calls "sexual selection," he argues, in other words, that when a variation has occurred of a kind to give to its possessor a preference in attraction for the other sex, then the larger choice which such a possessor of a variation will naturally have among the strong and vigorous of the opposite sex will tend to a superior multiplication of progeny inheriting the same variation. "If the individuals of one sex were during a long series of generations to prefer pairing with certain individuals of the other sex, characterized in some peculiar manner, the offspring would slowly but surely become modified in the same manner." While natural selection depends upon an advantage in gaining subsistence, possessed by one species and not possessed by a competing species, sexual selection depends upon advantages in relation to reproduction belonging to certain individuals of a sex and species, and not belonging to other individuals of the same sex and species. Mr. Darwin makes a laborious survey of animated creatures, marked by peculiarities of structure, colouring, and so forth, the acquisition of which seems to him most intelligibly explained by the theory that they have assisted their owners in the competition connected with reproduction. And this survey fills the greater part of his work.

Mr. Darwin has so far changed his ground as to discover in "sexual

selection" a force capable of accounting for many characters which, as not being beneficial in the struggle for existence, cannot be explained by the ordinary process of natural selection. Modifications of this kind have, as Mr. Darwin believes, been acquired through advantages which they conferred on their possessors in respect of propagation, by giving them the choice of the most vigorous and fruitful partners. He finds this agency to be the most satisfactory way of explaining such facts as the richer plumage of the peacock or the male pheasant, the brilliant top-knots of many male birds, and so on. These characteristics charm the female, and give their first possessors, those in whom the variation first appeared, a preference over rivals less favoured by nature, which, by attracting the most vigorous females, or a greater number of them, caused the variation to be more abundantly reproduced, according to the laws of inheritance and accumulation. With mammals the rivalry is less peaceful and apparently æsthetic than with birds. Their struggle goes mainly by law of battle, and depends on certain individuals of one sex "having been successful in conquering other males, and in their having left a larger number of offspring to inherit their superiority, than the less successful males"

But this theory does more than cover the difference of secondary sexual characters. It also explains the acquisition by individuals of both sexes of certain characters which cannot be adequately explained by natural selection, by any advantage, that is, which they have conferred on their possessors in the struggle for subsistence. Such characters, though possessed in the first instance by the male only, and giving him an advantage in respect of reproduction, are in given cases, by an observed uniformity, transmitted not only to the male offspring, but to the female also. On the conditions of this transmission of the variations in one sex to descendants of both sexes, and the limits and measures of its operation, Mr. Darwin says many pertinent and highly interesting things. The result of this transmission of both sexes is a permanent modification, and leads to differences in the conditions of race—such as colour, degree and locality of hairiness, shape of head, cheek-bones, nose, and the like. The lowest tribes of men admire their own characteristics in these respects, and "hence these and other such points could hardly fail to have been slowly and gradually exaggerated from the more powerful and able men in each tribe, who would succeed in rearing the largest number of offspring, having selected during many generations as their wives the most strongly characterized, and therefore most attractive women." There seems to us to be a difficulty here, which Mr. Darwin does not notice; for how is it, if after a characteristic has been thus established, the tribe resents or despises a novel variation, as so many peoples, for example, consider the whiteness of skin, or the preservation of the front teeth, to be detestable peculiarities, that yet that characteristic itself, before being permanently acquired, was seized as a delightful novelty? Mr. Darwin tells us, and gives us excellent reasons for thinking, that "the men of each race prefer what they are accustomed to behold; they cannot endure change" (ii. 354). Yet is there not an inconsistency between this fact and the other that one race differs from another exactly because novelties presented themselves and were eagerly seized and propagated? All the rare differences have been established through the passion for novelty, yet no sooner are they established than every novelty is straightway unendurable.

We shall not venture upon any criticisms of this remarkable book, which will be scarcely less useful as exercising thought, if many of the hypotheses which it suggests should prove to be unfounded. We will merely make one remark as to a point on which Mr. Darwin has naturally been exposed to much hostile criticism. He endeavours to account for the origin of the moral sense by which, according to many thinkers, man is most mainly distinguished from the whole brute creation. We are of opinion—and we could assign our reasons were it worth while—that Mr. Darwin has fallen into some confusion of language, and perhaps into some positive errors, from the use of a terminology with which the course of his studies have not rendered him so familiar as he is with all matters of natural science. At the same time, Mr. Darwin's views on this question are of special interest to many readers, because they point to the direction in which future controversies on such subjects are likely to extend. Mr. Darwin gives some highly ingenious explanations of the mode in which a moral sense may be presumed to have originated. If his account were adequate and satisfactory, we should be in a position to account for many things which puzzle previous inquirers; but even if that very large assumption were granted, there would still be room for the old controversy between the utilitarian and the intuitional schools, though it would take different forms, and be decided by different tests.

Mr. Darwin's theory, if completely established, would by no means prove that we have not an intuitive perception of certain moral truths, but would explain in what way those intuitions had been generated. The scientific reader of discussions would in many respects transform the problem; but the old divergence of opinion would still be true.

Without following out this line of thought, we may remark that considerations of this kind might serve to obviate the dread which some persons appear to entertain of the possible results of Mr. Darwin's investigations. In this as in other cases it is conceivable that men of science may explain how certain instincts gradually evolve themselves; but they are by no means the nearer to proving that the instincts have not a real existence, or that they do not possess all the value that has ever been attributed to them.

Various attacks have been made upon Mr. Darwin's theory, and few of the antagonists on either side have succeeded in rivalling the admirable candour and calmness which this great originator of thought has preserved in the midst of the warfare which he has stirred up in every direction. We shall content ourselves with noticing a contribution to a discussion more or less allied to Mr. Darwin's speculations, which has been carried on with an acrimony which is certainly to be regretted. The old feud between the disciples of Pasteur and Pouchet has recently been renewed in England; and Dr. Bastian, in his recently published book, takes the side of the possibility of spontaneous generation. He professes to have taken living organisms from flasks that had been a few months before hermetically sealed and heated to temperatures varying from 260° to 302° Fahrenheit.

But the theory is advanced by some of his antagonists that he was not sufficiently careful to exclude air, and that, in fact, his flasks not being hermetically sealed, he was liable to the same line of criticism as Pasteur in the early stages of the controversy applied to Pouchet. There is too much of the *argumentum ad hominem* in this style of answer, and the attribution of carelessness or error to other observers will not by any means suffice to end

the present dispute. In fact, we fail to discern in the sixty-five detailed experiments which are recounted at such enormous length in the present work, any thing like the carelessness or rashness which some months ago were attributed to Dr. Bastian. So far as appears, the experiments have been free from mistake; and we only see two ways of disproving the facts which appear on the face of the present work. The first is by supposing that Dr. Bastian has not duly closed the flasks so as to exclude the air; and the second is by accepting the theory that an observer, who is so renowned as a microscopical discoverer, really does not know a Bacterium when he sees it. The latter theory cannot readily be accepted. Is the former more probable? Here again there is no apparent probability that Dr. Bastian has become a victim to self-delusion with regard to the perfect closure of the flasks. Therefore we cannot yet awhile assent to the condemnation of his facts.

Four theories with respect to the origin of these simple forms of life have been promulgated. 1. That they are independent organisms derived by fission or gemmation from pre-existing Bacteria or Torulæ. 2. That they represent subordinate stages in the life history of other organisms (fungi), from some portion of which they have derived their origin, and into which again they tend to develope. These methods are termed those of homogenesis, the former being called direct and the latter indirect. 3. That they may have a heterogenetic mode of origin, owing to the more complete individualization of minute particles of living matter entering into the composition of higher organisms, both animal and vegetable. 4. That they may arise *de novo* in certain fluids containing organic matter, independently of pre-existing living things (*archebiosis*). The last theory is what Dr. Bastian thinks he has proved, and what at present we are unable to disprove, except by the arguments to which we have above alluded.

We will venture to touch briefly upon a question of a very different kind. It has lately been attempted by Mr. Crookes and others to subject the phenomena generally known as spiritualistic to a series of scientific tests. A society, which describes itself as the Dialectical Society of London, has appointed a committee, who held a number of sittings, and produced a quantity of evidence on the subject. A very admirable article, subsequently acknowledged to be from the pen of Dr. Carpenter, dealt with the whole question in the *Quarterly Review* for October. Although the Dialectical Society is not constituted in such a manner as to command very much respect from careful observers, it is still remarkable in many ways that a superstition of this kind should be flourishing in modern society. Mr. Crookes, too, is a man of a certain scientific reputation, and the name of "psychic force" which he has invented, and which heads a pamphlet published by him, has done something to force the matter on public attention by giving it a certain scientific flavour.

All kinds of extraordinary and absurd manifestations have been witnessed by persons who report them to the Dialectical Society. Ghosts have been seen walking about in rooms. Mr. Home, the well-known medium, has been lengthened and shortened; he has been carried out of the window of a room at a height of seventy feet above a street, and carried back again through another window. These stories, and stories such as these are gravely refuted and made the subjects of serious argument.

It is difficult to speak or think with any thing else than contemptuous pain of proceedings such as those described in this report. Mr. Crookes has, however, given some prominence to alleged physical movements in solid bodies, which he believes can be produced by the emission from the body, and apparently from the finger-ends, of a pseudo-force unknown and undescribed. His experiments, set forth in a recent number of the *Quarterly Journal of Science*, have an appearance of precision. We see, however, in the primary point, that no means are taken to interpose between the mover and the thing to be moved an indicator of any kind. The index is, so to speak, attached to the wrong end of the beam; and, to speak frankly also, experiments conducted by Mr. Home, as these were, are by that very fact now suspicious. Mr. Crookes' papers have been thought by investigators as impartial as Professor Stokes not to be worthy of discussion before serious scientific societies; but it would be well that they should be submitted to competent independent scrutiny. If they have any value, they lead to a branch of physical investigation widely different from spiritualism. According to the existing data of science, it seems improbable that any emission of transformed electric or other currents from the human body can produce under the stated conditions the appreciable dynamic effect which his index shows; but the improbability is not inherent, inasmuch as the constant correlation of electric effects with every muscular contraction is a matter of familiar knowledge and a part of the teaching of every physiological primer. The improbability is of that secondary character which arises from the collision of Mr. Crookes' observations with those of ordinary life, and of experiments hitherto made. That the phenomena of ordinary muscular action are attended with electric charge and discharge is a doctrine developed at length in Mr. Radcliff's recent studies in vital "electro-dynamics," and it is just possible, though unlikely, that Mr. Crookes' experiments studied in this connexion may not be without value. It is unfortunate that he has accepted for them at the hands of Mr. Cox the misnomer of "psychic force," and the scepticism with which they are regarded by experienced physicists deters us from giving much importance to them. In any case, however, they are rather curious and doubtful than incredible. They may be valueless, but they are at least removed from the supernatural and the absurd, and give no countenance to the follies which disgrace the reports of the Dialectical Society.

The British Association held its meeting at Edinburgh, and the proceedings were opened on the 3rd of August, by an address from the President, Sir W. Thompson. Sir William began by referring to the many eminent men of science who have been lost to us during the preceding twelve months; most prominent among these was Sir John Herschel, to whose eminent services the President paid an eloquent tribute. Another honour to British Science was lost in Professor De Morgan, and the President remarked that if his book on the Differential Calculus was now less studied than of old, the neglect was only due to the fact that it was not convenient for examination purposes, a remark which incidentally throws some light upon the less desirable tendencies of competitive examination. The President next referred to the services rendered by the observatory at Kew, which has now, by Mr. Cassiot's munificent gift of 10,000*l.*, become independent of the voluntary contributions of the Association.

After referring to the useful results of the scientific labours of different

sections of the Association, and illustrating his remarks by various appropriate instances, the President proceeded to make some observations on the great problem to which we have already referred in discussing Mr. Darwin's work on the Origin of Life. He remarked that many thinkers still clung to the ancient hypothesis that dead matter may have run together, or crystallized, or fermented into "germs of life," or "organic cells," or "protoplasmia." Science, he said, had brought a vast mass of inductive evidence to bear against this theory, as had been explained at great length by Professor Huxley, the previous occupant of the presidential chair. The experiments of such men as Huchet, Pasteur, and Bastian were indeed worthy of careful attention; but Sir William confessed to being deeply impressed by Professor Huxley's views, and to be ready to adopt, as an article of scientific faith, that through all space and through all time life proceeds from life, and from nothing but life. How then, he asked, did life originate on the earth? Every year thousands and millions of fragments of solid matter fall upon the earth, and it is often assumed that meteoric stones are fragments which have been broken off from larger masses and launched into space. It is as certain that collisions must occur between heavenly bodies as that ships, steered without intelligence, could not cross the Atlantic for thousands of years without them. If the earth ever meets a body of dimensions comparable to its own, whilst still clothed with vegetation, fragments, bearing seeds and animals, must be launched into space. It is probable, then, that these are countless meteoric seed-bearing bodies. If, at the present moment, there were no life on earth, and one of them fell upon it, it might lead to its being covered with vegetation. The hypothesis that life originated here from the moss-grown fragments of another world might seem wild and visionary, but Sir William maintained that it was not unscientific. In conclusion, Sir William remarked that the argument from design had been too much lost sight of in recent zoological speculations. Remarks against the frivolities of teleology, such as are found not rarely in the notes of learned commentators on "Paley's Natural Theology," had had a temporary effect in turning attention from the solid and impregnable argument so well put forward in that excellent old book. But overpoweringly strong proofs of intelligent and benevolent design lie all around us; and if ever perplexities, whether metaphysical or scientific, turn us away from them for a time, they come back upon us with irresistible force, showing to us through nature the influence of a free will, and teaching us that all living beings depend on one ever *acting* creative power.

Other papers of much interest occupied the attention of the Association on subsequent occasions. Professor Tait delivered an eloquent address, though chiefly of too technical a character for our pages. Colonel Yule discussed the state of our knowledge of the regions between India and China. Professor Abel gave a popular lecture on Explosive Compounds; Mr. Glaisher read the report of the Committee on Luminous Meteors. Mr. Pengelly and Mr. Symonds gave accounts of investigations into various bone-bearing caves. Colonel Leslie read a paper on ancient hieroglyphic sculptures, many examples of which have been found in the British islands, we have, however, no space to give any thing like a complete catalogue.

The meeting was on the whole successful, but a certain damp was thrown upon the proceedings by an unfortunate misunderstanding. The people of

Edinburgh, it seems, fancied themselves to have been slighted because the preference was given last year to Liverpool, as the place of meeting of the Association. On the present occasion, the renewed invitation came from the University, whilst the town held aloof, and consequently the members of the Association were scarcely received with that warmth of welcome to which they have been generally accustomed. On the whole, however, they cannot be said to have undergone many hardships in their pursuit of science.

PART II.

CHRONICLE

OF REMARKABLE OCCURRENCES

IN 1871.

JANUARY.

1. ON this day closed the connexion between Church and State in Ireland.

2. THE PREMIER AND HIS CONSTITUENTS.—The following petition was issued by some of the constituency in different parts of the borough of Greenwich, calling upon the Premier to resign his seat as one of the representatives of the borough :—“ To the Right Hon. William Ewart Gladstone, M.P. :—We, the undersigned, electors of the borough of Greenwich, approach you with that consideration which your exalted position and talents necessarily command, and, in respectfully soliciting from you the restitution of the trust reposed in you, of representing us in Parliament, we beg briefly to place our reasons for so doing before the world. From the time you became member for Greenwich you have never visited the borough, nor has a single interest connected with it engaged even your passing attention. Our trade has completely departed, our dockyards are silent—a fact of which Russia seems cognizant—and, in a word, your ill-timed and miserable economy has converted this old historic place into a scene of pauperism and desolation. When we turn from this dreary contemplation of our own affairs to the country at large, we find less reason to place confidence in you. The whole of the last two Sessions were occupied in passing two measures affecting the sister country—namely, the Irish Church Bill and the Landlord and Tenant Bill—yet Ireland remains dissatisfied and discontented. Such has been the result of your domestic policy ; and, on looking to foreign affairs, we find still less reason for congratulation. It was reserved for the veteran leader of the Whigs, Earl Russell, to sound the alarm trumpet, and to demand the immediate enrolment of 100,000 men for the defence of the country. In the beginning of last year, when all looked so calm and serene, that Earl Granville

thought no cloud darkened the political horizon, you commenced that disastrous reduction in all departments of the State which enabled the Chancellor of the Exchequer to form a plausible, yet deceitful Budget for the country. Now that the horizon is not so clear, whether we look at the serious complications of the Russian question, or the terrible and altered state of the European questions, we still find you in the same state of suicidal apathy. This word 'apathy' does not express to our minds the full measure of your shortcomings, because your War Minister, Mr. Cardwell, had the audacity to state in the House of Commons that he had in store 300,000 breechloading rifles—a statement which he must (officially) have known contained the grossest misstatement of facts ever attempted to be foisted on the House of Commons. Such are our reasons—political, social, and local—upon which we respectfully, yet firmly, demand the restoration of our abused trust."

—THE EMPRESS EUGENIE'S NEW YEAR'S LEVEE.—The Duc de Persigny, the Marquis de Lavalette and his son, Baron Jerome David, M. Rouher, M. de Bouville, and fifty or sixty of the principal French families now residing in this country, were received by the Empress of the French at Chiselhurst.

—THE LONDON DEMOCRATS AND THE EDUCATION BOARD.—The various sections of London democrats held a remarkable gathering at the Hole-in-the-Wall, Kirby-street, Hatton-garden, to celebrate, with feasting, speech-making, and other joyous observances, the return of Mr. Lucraft, working man, to the London School Board. Mr. W. Odger, the late "labour" candidate for Southwark, presided, and among those present were many well-known members of the organizations which had existed since the Reform League agitations.

LADY STUDENTS.—The question of the admission of lady students to the ward of the Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh came up for discussion at the election of managers for the year. Two lists were submitted, and at the close of a long discussion, in which Mrs. Henry Kingsley and Miss Jex Blake took part, 100 voted against the admission of ladies, and 96 in favour. The votes were to be scrutinized.

3. THE FIRST CASES UNDER THE NEW LAND ACT came before Mr. Otway, Q.C., chairman of the county of Antrim, at the Quarter Sessions of Ballymena. Mr. Hill, a tenant on the Glenarm estate of Lord Antrim, claimed 750*l.* as compensation for disturbance of occupancy. The claim included 400*l.* paid by the tenant on coming into occupation, 100*l.* for manuring 20 acres in 1870, 6*l.* for laying down grasses in 1870, 150*l.* for continuous improvements in 1870, by liming, manuring, draining, fencing, and general cultivation. Against this demand the landlord had a cross claim of 700*l.* for deterioration of the farm through bad cultivation, general injury to the entire farm, dilapidation of buildings, breaking up old lea-ground, and exclusion from the possession after the 1st of November last. The case sought to be made on cross-examination was that the first tenant was extravagant and unfortunate in his farming, and

that the land had been deteriorated and injured during the tenancy of the claimant. At the close of the case, Mr. Otway announced that he would give judgment at the Land Sessions of Belfast.

4. THE FLYING SQUADRON, comprising the screw-frigates "Narcissus," twenty-eight, Captain W. Codrington, bearing the flag of Rear-Admiral Beauchamp Seymour, C.B., Admiral in command of the squadron, and the "Immortalité," twenty-eight, Captain F. W. Sullivan, C.B.; and the screw-corvettes "Cadmus" and "Volage" sailed from Plymouth Sound for Lisbon, Madeira, Barbadoes, and several other of the British West India Islands, including Jamaica, whence the squadron, probably calling at Havannah, was to proceed to Bermuda, where the "Pylades" screw-corvette was expected to join. The cruise was to occupy four or five months, but a great deal of latitude to be allowed both as to ports of call and the duration of the visit. The squadron left Plymouth with a fine easterly breeze.

5. A PUBLIC MEETING was held at the City Terminus Hotel, to express sympathy with France, and to discuss the expediency of calling upon the Government to take the initiative in promoting peace. About 1000 persons were present, and Mr. Lockyer, jun., was called to the chair. The speaking was begun by Mr. Merri-man, who blamed the King of Prussia and the Lord Mayor equally. Two resolutions were adopted; one—"That we, citizens of London, in public meeting assembled, declare our abhorrence of the war now waged by Prussia in France. We do so in the interest of both countries, as well as on behalf of peace, justice, and humanity; and, in the conviction that equitable terms can be more easily arranged at the present than at any future stage of this devastating conflict, we call on her Majesty's Government to press for effectual negotiations between Prussia and France, with the view of procuring an honourable and lasting peace." The second, moved by Sir Henry Hoare, was to this effect:—"That we, citizens of London, are compelled to record our reprobation of the policy of Prussia, since the surrender of Sedan, in continuing the war for territorial aggrandisement, and prosecuting it with a severity alike unwise and unmerciful."

Another meeting for the same object was held in the evening at the New Hall of Science, Old-street-road, Mr. Austin Holyoake presiding. Messrs. Bradlaugh and Odger were the chief speakers.

7. THE BRITISH VESSELS SUNK AT DUCLAIR.—An inquiry was held by Mr. Candlish, M.P., and Mr. R. M. Hudson, respecting three of the vessels, the "Jane Tindell," the "M'Laren," and the "Alice," belonging to Sunderland.

Captain Embleton, the master of the "Alice," stated that he arrived at Duclair on December 19, when he was hailed by the Prussians, and let go his anchor. He had his English ensign flying at the time. He did not see any of the Prussian authorities that day. On the following day he, with the other captains, saw the chief military authority, and asked for permission to proceed

down the river. They were told they could not do so, but had better go back to Rouen, and received a permit to do so. When they were leaving, the officer said to them, in English, "Take my advice, go back to Rouen, for this is not a safe place for you." They returned to their vessels, and found the "Ann" sunk, and the "Sally Gale" being towed out to be scuttled. The "Alice" was prevented leaving for Rouen on account of the darkness, and on the next day (21st) nine or ten Prussians went on board and took full possession of the ship. The commander of the soldiers, in the best way he could, gave him to understand that he was going to sink the ship, saying, "I am going to *couler* (sink) your ship; the general will come and give you a paper for the guilt." When the officer took possession, he told him the vessel belonged to a neutral country, and showed him the flag; but it was no use, they towed her away and sunk her. He afterwards saw one of the military authorities on shore, who asked him the price of his ship. He received a paper, properly signed and sealed, in German, certifying that the officer had "requisitioned" the "Alice," whose value was estimated at 2400*l*. He did not ask for money. He got part of his clothes. A note was sent to the British Vice-Consul (Mr. Herring) at Rouen, who went to Duclair, and went on board the Prussian steam-tug to protest against the sinking of the ships. After the ships were sunk, the crews got leave to go to Rouen (a distance of thirty miles), there being no shelter at Duclair. They went part of the way in their boats, which were afterwards chopped up by the Prussians. They were afterwards sent on to London. The Prussians did not behave badly to them, nor rob them, and his ship was not fired at.

Captain Adamson, of the "Jane Tindell," said he left Rouen on December 17th, with a properly stamped permit for England. After being once overhauled by the Prussians, the vessel arrived at La Fontaine on the 19th. There was a strong breeze, and he anchored to prevent the ship leaving the channel. His anchor was on the ground when the Prussians shot twice over the ship; one shot went over the bows, and, the ship swinging at the time, the second went between the masts and into the river. He considered they fired across his bows, which was the usual signal to bring up; they did not fire at him. No one boarded him, and three-quarters of an hour afterwards, in consequence of the wind counteracting the tide, he dropped down the river without any hindrance. He arrived at Duclair on the 18th, and took in ballast until mid-day of the 20th, when, although he had a permit, he went and asked the authorities to permit him to proceed to England. The official wrote something in German on his permit, and gave him to understand he could not go to England, but must proceed to Rouen, as it was not safe to remain at Duclair, the French gunboats being expected. In returning to his ship, he found that the schooner "Ann" was sunk. On the 21st, about three o'clock in the afternoon, the Prussians took possession of the ship, the soldiers cut the moorings, hove up the

anchor, and jumped into the hold with augurs, to scuttle her. All this was done without asking any questions of him. He was afterwards asked to haul down his flag, but he declined. The ship was then sunk. The vice-consul got him an agreement to pay 1800*l.*, the value of his ship, from the Prussians.

Captain Hodgson, of the "*M'Laren*," related a similar story. The consul got him permission to go the extent of the Prussian lines to take in his ballast. He left Rouen on the 14th, and having been twice overhauled by the Prussians, arrived at Duclair on the 19th, when he commenced to take in his ballast. He detailed the interview with the official who gave them the pass to go to Rouen, when they were prevented doing so by the state of the tide. On the 21st about a score of Prussians went on board, and called upon him to haul his flag down, but he would not, and to the best of his belief the ship went down with it flying. The consul protested against the proceedings, and obtained him an assessment of 2000*l.* for the ship. He never saw the flag trampled on.

This concluded the inquiry, and Mr. Candlish stated that he would render them every assistance in bringing their claims before Government.

—THE FENIAN PRISONERS.—Five of the released Fenian prisoners—O'Donovan Rossa, O'Connell, Shaw, M'Clure, and Devoy—left the Mersey for New York, on board the Royal Mail steamer "*Cuba*," as first-class passengers. Some of their friends witnessed their departure. A mere formal recognition only and a waving of handkerchiefs were allowed. The released prisoners left London accompanied by Captain Griffiths, deputy-governor of Millbank, and four warders. Rossa and M'Clure were to be expatriated for twenty years, and O'Connell and Devoy for four and five years. On the vessel's arrival at Queenstown committees from Dublin and Cork went on board, and furnished each of the men with an outfit and 20*l.* Mrs. Rossa joined her husband there. The prisoners expressed themselves satisfied with the terms of their pardon and their treatment by the Government.

9. MR. GLADSTONE'S CONSTITUENTS.—A meeting was held in the Lecture Hall, Greenwich, in support of the requisition requesting Mr. Gladstone to resign his seat. The Liberals of the borough repudiated all connexion with the affair, although the bills calling the meeting were printed in the colour and style adopted by them. Long before the time at which the meeting was to commence, the hall—which holds about 1300 persons—was filled to overflowing by two distinct parties, one composed of artisans and men of the tradesmen class, the other of about sixty "*roughs*," headed by prizefighters. Captain Dominy took the chair, but the meeting refused to hear him, and called upon Dr. Bennett to preside. Captain Dominy was heard by the reporters to declare that the requisition had been signed by 4000 persons.

Two resolutions—one expressing want of confidence in Mr. Gladstone as a Minister and as a member for the borough, and another

calling on the electors to sign the requisition as soon as possible—were moved in dumb show, and amid “a scene of indescribable confusion and noise,” Mr. Baxter Langley came to the front and attempted to obtain a hearing. “The roughs” (the *Times* reporter said) “then rushed down in a body, overturned the chairman’s table, chairs, reporters’ table, and every thing else at hand, and tried hard to break them up. They completely cleared the platform of friends, opponents, and reporters, and they had to themselves the whole of the space usually occupied by the speakers and friends. Here for a time they jumped about and scrambled among themselves, the meeting meanwhile looking on in no small alarm.” At length Mr. Baxter Langley managed to make himself heard, and disclaimed all connexion with the requisition, though he admitted that Mr. Gladstone had not paid that kind of respect to the electors of the borough which was due to them. He could not, however, agree with the statement in the requisition that the last two sessions had been wasted in doing justice to Ireland, nor could he agree with the proposition that England should do something in the war which she had not done. Mr. Langley added that the Liberal party, in closing the dockyards, were only acting in accordance with a decision already arrived at before they came into power. A working man then proposed a vote of confidence in Mr. Gladstone, and, after much confusion, it was put to the meeting. Hands were held up for it amid a great noise, and, the contrary being put, no hands appeared. The resolution was then declared to be carried, and the proceedings concluded with a shout of cheers for Gladstone.

—GREAT FIRE AT AN OIL REFINER’S IN LAMBETH.—An extensive fire, the brilliancy of which attracted some thousands of persons to the Thames Embankment and the bridges across the Thames, occurred at Messrs. Younghusband’s oil refining works, Old Barge House Wharf, Lambeth. As many as sixteen land steam-engines and two “floats” were playing on the fire at one time, but the flames having attacked the cellars and warehouses, in which were stored an unusual quantity of oil and several casks of vitriol, the copious streams of water appeared to have no effect. The fate of the engine-house, machinery, and refinery, immediately fronting the Thames, was soon apparent, and the flames, ascending with extraordinary force, illuminated the metropolis for some distance. Although the firemen were enabled to keep the flames from spreading, the reflection of the fire was seen for several hours. The premises adjoined “Ward’s Wharf,” destroyed about twelve months ago by fire, but since rebuilt.

10. SERIOUS FIRE AT HOLLAND HOUSE.—This well-known mansion had a narrow escape of being totally destroyed by fire. About one o’clock one of the servants in charge of the premises discovered smoke issuing from the sides of the hearthstone in Lady Holland’s sitting-room in the eastern wing. A small fire-engine belonging to the establishment was brought into action, but the flames made rapid progress behind the splendid panelled wainscot, through the

ceilings, into the floor above. The engines of the London Brigade were sent for, and, pending their arrival, the matchless antique furniture, pictures, and articles of vertu were removed; but owing to the hasty manner in which this work had to be performed, the things were much damaged. At least 2000*l.*, it was said, would be required to repair the loss. Lady Holland was absent from town at the time of the occurrence.

— AN EXTRAORDINARY CASE was tried before the Recorder of London. Mr. A. H. W. Lamb, a barrister, was accused of stealing and selling books from the Library of Lincoln's Inn. There was no doubt that he had had possession of books from that library, or that they had been sold, and the only points were how he got them and who sold them. His own statement was that a man named Langbourne had called upon him, had described himself as a solicitor retiring from practice, and had from time to time sold him the books subsequently ascertained to belong to the Library. Mr. Lamb could not, however, find Mr. Langbourne, and denied positively that he sold the books,—a point, however, upon which the purchaser, a Mr. Turner, was most positive, as were the experts who examined the receipts taken by Mr. Turner. The jury found the accused guilty, with the approval of the judge, who sentenced him to nine months' hard labour.

— COLLIERY EXPLOSION NEAR SHEFFIELD.—A terrible explosion took place near Sheffield. The scene of the accident was Renishan Park, near Eckington, at a mine belonging to Messrs. J. and G. Wells. The colliery was about eight miles from Sheffield. Eight hundred miners were employed in it and in the adjoining works belonging to the same firm. The men worked in shifts of 100 each. Fortunately at eleven p.m., the time of the explosion, only sixty men were employed in these particular workings, known as the "Silkstone Mine." The said workings were reached by two shafts, 225 yards in depth, and about 600 yards apart. The explosion apparently took place about 400 yards from the bottom of the down shaft. Its exact cause was not known; but half a dozen men were repairing the way, and it was believed that in so doing a portion of the roof was displaced, whereby a quantity of foul air was liberated. This gas, in some unexplained manner, was fired. The report of the accident caused great alarm in the neighbourhood, and the now too frequent unhappy scene which invariably accompanies such catastrophes was enacted at the mouth of the pit. A large number of persons, anxious wives and mothers among the number, soon congregated. The men immediately organized an exploring party, and a careful examination of the mine was commenced. Twenty-seven of the miners were found dead, and eleven others were seriously injured. Most of the deceased were married, and left families. As the bodies were brought to the top and recognized by their wives, children, or friends, the heartrending scene was beyond description. The pit had been in working operation about a dozen years, and during that time no serious accident had occurred.

11. NORWICH ELECTION PETITION.—Mr. Justice Keating gave judgment in this case, the hearing of which had occupied some days. Mr. Tillett had stood for Norwich in 1868 on purity principles, and, it was shown in evidence, tried honestly to act upon them. He was, however, obliged to submit to a coalition with Sir W. Russell, the other Liberal candidate, and one of Sir W. Russell's agents, Mr. O. D. Ray, was, in the opinion of the Court which tried the case, guilty of bribery; and Mr. Tillett, having coalesced with Sir W. Russell, must legally be held to have made Ray his agent. A perfectly pure election followed in 1870, but Mr. Tillett was still liable for the old offence, and on petition the judge, Mr. Justice Keating, was compelled, with great reluctance, to unseat him. He, however, described the conviction as "a cruel consequence of the law of agency," and refused costs. In defending the law, Mr. Justice Keating uttered this noteworthy remark:—"It might seem hard that a single act of bribery should void the election, but it was not necessary that a candidate should be tainted at all; when acts of bribery were committed, the election became utterly void."

12. MILL ON WOMAN'S SUFFRAGE.—Mr. Mill gave an address at Edinburgh in favour of women's votes. His argument was, that so long as women have not equal rights with men they will never be fairly treated. Men's good feeling could not be trusted to secure it. That was shown every day by the police reports. Either there must be a great improvement in human nature, or women must have the suffrage, and of the two he thought the suffrage was likely to be the sooner obtained. In conclusion, Mr. Mill said,—“Even apart from justice, there are many reasons why the suffrage should be given to women, but I will content myself with two. One, and the strongest, is that which has often been unthinkingly employed on the other side—woman has so much power already! A man's wife is very often the real promoter of his public actions, yet it is only an extremely small minority of women who have any thing that deserves the name of a conscience on public affairs. How could a woman have a conscience about public affairs if she were taught to believe that they were no concern of hers? Give women the same rights as men, and the same obligations would follow. Another reason is the vast amount of brain power and practical business talent which now lie waste for want of outlet into that great field of public usefulness, in which no one would pretend that such qualities were not very much wanted. The whole movement of modern society, from the middle ages until now, and which has been greatly accelerated in the present century, points in the direction of the political enfranchisement of women. Their exclusion is the last remnant of the old state of society. The régime of privileges and disabilities, and of all monopolies, is gone or going, and the whole spirit of the time is against predetermining by law that one set of persons should be allowed by right of birth to have and to do what others are not by any amount of exertion or superiority of talent allowed to attain.”

— A GREAT JEWEL ROBBERY took place at the shop of Messrs. London and Ryder, which was traced to a husband and wife of the name of Tarpey. (*For details see Remarkable Trials.*)

14. EXTRAORDINARY SCORE AT BILLIARDS.—Bennett, the champion, and W. Cook, Jun., played the second match of the series of exhibition contests announced for every Saturday throughout the season at St. James's Hall, which will long be remembered for having given William Cook an opportunity of excelling his hitherto unequalled monster break of 531. Prior to commencing the break scores of 108 and 90 had already been credited to Cook, whose figures had reached 350 to Bennett's 218. Then after a few cannons and hazards the ex-champion worked his way up to the spot, and scored 37 in succession off the spot hazard, after which he lost position, but, regaining it soon afterwards, added 85 more. Again he failed to get situated properly for the spot stroke, and made 9 more before he got back to the old place, when he soon finished the match by making 64 chassapots. As, however, the spectators wished the break completed, Cook went on scoring, and added 34 more hazards ere he made a miss-cue and broke down after scoring in all 752 (220 spots). After he had scored 446, an interval of a quarter of an hour was allowed, but the break was otherwise uninterrupted. Cook scored 204 points in sixteen minutes, and the last 102 in seven minutes. The game altogether lasted one hour and three quarters.

16. THE GREAT PAIR-OARED MATCH ON THE TYNE.—The great pair-oared match for 200*l.* a side between James Renforth, of Newcastle (champion sculler of England), and Harry Kelley, of Putney, against James Taylor, of Newcastle, and J. Thomas Winship, of Dentventhaugh, came off upon the Tyne at Newcastle, in the presence of several thousands of people. There was a great amount of betting, chiefly at 11 to 8 on Renforth and Kelley, who took the south course at the start, which took place shortly after ten o'clock. Renforth and Kelley succeeded in getting the first dip, the result being that they at once took a lead, which they increased to half a length before 150 yards had been rowed. Taylor and Winship, however, succeeded in slightly decreasing the lead of their opponents. Renforth and Kelley put on a spurt and drove their boat ahead, and by the time that a quarter of a mile had been rowed they took Taylor and Winship's water. Passing under Redheugh Bridge, half a mile from the start, Renforth and Kelley were leading by three lengths, which they maintained until opposite the gas-works. At this point both boats were steered out towards mid-channel in order to avoid a large block of ice. Renforth and Kelley, however, ran their boat amongst several small blocks of ice, bringing their craft to a stand-still and turning its head almost to the south. Taylor and Winship, owing to their opponents' mishap, were enabled to draw their boat to within a length of their opponents, and a foul was feared. Renforth and Kelley, however, with a powerful stroke forced their way through the ice, and they were followed immediately by the other boat. Renforth and Kelley at once began to recover themselves, and

again drew their boat forward, until at the end of two miles they were leading by six lengths. The race was now virtually over, as the leaders were rowing well within their power. Nearing the finish they eased, and ultimately rowed under Scotswood Bridge easy winners by from nine to ten lengths. Time, as taken by Benson's chronograph, 26 min. 22½ sec.

17. THE CONFERENCE.—The Black Sea conference assembled at the Foreign Office at one o'clock, Lord Granville presiding. Austria was represented by Count Apponyi, Italy by Signor Cadorna, Prussia by Count Bernstorff, Russia by Baron Brunnow, and Turkey by Musurus Pasha. No representative of France was present. The proceedings were of a formal nature, and the meeting was adjourned to Tuesday, 24th January, in order to afford an additional chance for the arrival of a French Plenipotentiary.

The apartment of the Foreign Office in which the sitting was held is called the Smaller Conference Room, in contradistinction to the magnificent hall known as the Conference Room.

—THE "INTERNATIONAL."—Sir R. Phillimore gave judgment in the case of the ship "International," which had been seized on the ground that she had on board a cable which was to be used in the military service of France. It was to be laid along the French coast between Bordeaux and Havre. He decided that the telegraph company had made out their claim to have the ship released, for although the cable might be used for military purposes, primarily its object was of a commercial character. At the same time he was of opinion that there was reasonable and proper cause for detaining the vessel and cargo, and he therefore made no order as to costs or damages.

23. DEMONSTRATION IN TRAFALGAR-SQUARE. — A demonstration called in Trafalgar-square, to protest against the bombardment of Paris, and against the inaction of the English Government in the war, was held despite the miserable weather, and for nearly two hours a very large throng of persons stood in the rainy and windy night, listening to bitter denunciations of the English and Prussian governing powers. The organized procession started for Trafalgar-square from a back thoroughfare of the Farringdon-road, the headquarters of the "Pioneers of Liberty," led by a brass band playing the "Marseillaise." Some fifteen flags were carried, and these of a peculiar character. Many were simply red, with a cap of liberty, of very bad workmanship and ugly shape, surmounting each pole. One of those not simply red was decorated with stars, and dedicated to the "United States of Europe;" another to the "Universal Republic and France," while a third distinct flag had the inscription, "Long life to Gambetta and Jules Favre." The bearers had red ribands about their arms, and some, in addition, wore sashes of the same hue about their waists.

The procession draggled rather than marched through the back streets of Hatton-garden, crossed Leather-lane, and debouched into Holborn from Brook-street, and then proceeded towards the square

by way of St. Martin's-lane. It was more a drifting crowd than a procession. There was a crowd in the square waiting for the procession, and full possession was taken of the usual platform—the foot of Nelson's Monument, on a level with the lions—some time before the procession reached the spot. The crowd was a very large one, and there was a full muster of the rough element present, ready, apparently, for any mischief. They cheered lustily a half-drunk soldier who pushed his way to the front and called, "in the name of the English army," for three cheers for France.

The meeting was formed on the side facing Cockspur-street, and great pains were taken, with indifferent success, to light the spot by means of the "flamers," the peculiar out-door lights used by costermongers. A large number in the crowd were, to all appearances, practically acquainted with the use of the flamers, and this knowledge led to two disadvantages, for at one period of the evening the costermongers shouted out instructions how the lights should be managed, and so disturbed the proceedings; and in the after-part they gave their assistance, and tumbled the framework on which the lamps were hanging, the lamps themselves, and the burning fluid among the assemblage.

Mr. Odger occupied the post of Chairman; and among the resolutions proposed and carried was one condemning the action of the Government in dismissing from their corps all Volunteers who took part in the demonstration, and proposing that they should have their names inscribed on a golden flag, while the names of commanding officers who dismissed them should be inscribed on a black flag.

25. AN EXTRAORDINARY CASE came before the Irish Court of Common Pleas, on a motion for the postponement of a trial in which a gentleman named Captain Poynter sought to recover 10,000*l.* damages for an assault. The motion was made on behalf of the defendant, Mr. John Grey Vesey Porter, of Belle Isle, County Fermanagh, to obtain a postponement of the action for damages until the sittings after next term, the object being that in the meantime a divorce suit should be heard in which Mr. Porter was petitioner and his wife respondent. Mr. Porter admitted the assault, but pleaded in mitigation that Captain Poynter had seduced his wife. Mr. Poynter was the son of a gentleman of property in the county of Kent, and an officer in the 16th Regiment. He was popular with the gentry of the county, and made the acquaintance of the defendant, a gentleman of position and of large means, who lived at a picturesque spot on the margin of Lough Erne. After the plaintiff's commission had been sold he remained for some time at Enniskillen on a visit with the officers of his regiment, by whom he was much liked. On Saturday, the 3rd of December, he had made arrangements with his own company to have a photographic group taken. At ten o'clock in the morning he was in his own bedroom, when a man named Oldcroft, the defendant's butler, called and told him that Mrs. Porter had sent him to say that she wished to see him on the Dublin-road, near the Model School, which was on the main-

land about a quarter of a mile from Enniskillen, and in the direction of Mr. Porter's residence. He replied that he could not go. Oldcraft came a second time with a more pressing message, and again he refused to go. At two o'clock the butler returned and said that Mrs. Porter was surprised that Captain Poynter did not go to her, and that if he went then she would not detain him five minutes. The place to which he was invited was on the coach road to Dublin. When the third message came he was engaged in the barrack-square, and he told Oldcraft that he would go, and walking down the road he met the butler coming for him again. Oldcraft told him that Mrs. Porter was in a boat under the bank at Killyhevin, a pretty country seat within a mile of Enniskillen. After he had proceeded about 150 yards down an avenue leading towards Killyhevin, five men sprang out from behind a clump of trees, and surrounded him, cutting off his retreat. One of them then gagged him with a strap, another garrotted him, seizing him by the throat from behind, and they also tied his wrists with a rope. They carried him to a boat, in which he saw Mr. Porter with two guns, which he afterwards saw were capped. Having flung him to the bottom of the boat, they threw a rug over him and rowed away. The defendant held the strap, which served as a gag. He succeeded in getting the strap from across his mouth, and asked the defendant what that treatment was for; that he had never done him any harm. The defendant replied, "Lie down, you blackguard, or I'll strike you. You know what it is for; the unfortunate woman has confessed." He made no reply. The defendant struck him repeatedly with his fists during the passage down the lake to Belle Isle. Both his eyes were blackened. They were fully two hours in the boat. The defendant called for a pair of scissors, and, taking them in his hand, said, "Now, I am going to put the Belle Isle mark on you." At that time he had pulled Mr. Poynter towards him, and had his head fixed between his knees. He cut off the plaintiff's hair, and while so engaged remarked, "Perhaps you would like to send a lock of your hair to your lady friends at Enniskillen." He was then put back to his former position in the bottom of the boat. The defendant flung water on him from a tin pannikin repeatedly during the passage to Belle Isle. On arriving there the men unfastened the ropes, and walked him up between them to the terrace in front of the house, where two large upright beams had been erected with a transverse one connecting them. Mr. Porter told his servants to keep the big bell ringing, and that the bugler of his band should sound the assembly. The plaintiff was then secured to the transverse beam, his feet barely touching the ground. Two whips were brought, with one of which Mr. Porter commenced to flagellate him. He broke the whip against one of the upright posts, and then got the second, saying as he took it, "Now I will show you what I am going to do to a blackguard English officer." He flogged him for about ten minutes, and then went away, after saying to his men, "Boys, this is the best day's work you have

done yet; I will give you each 5*l.*, and, Oldcraft, I will give you 10*l.*” During the flogging one of the bystanders said, “Oh, Master John, that is enough.”

This remarkable act of summary vengeance formed the subject of a long and exciting investigation, which ended in the disagreement of the jury who had to try the case.

—SIR RICHARD MAYNE.—The ceremony of unveiling a monument erected to the memory of the late Sir Richard Mayne took place at Kensal Green Cemetery, in the presence of a large number of members of the metropolitan police force. The monument bore the following inscription:—“Sir Richard Mayne, K.C.B.; born November 27, 1796; died December 26, 1868. The officers and constables of the metropolitan police have raised this monument as a record of their high appreciation of his great ability, independence of character, and unswerving integrity as commissioner of the police of the metropolis during a period of nearly forty years from the foundation of the force in 1829.”

FEBRUARY.

7. A PARIS BALLOON IN SURREY.—The following letter appeared in the *Times*. “The following has been addressed to the editor of the *Surrey and Hants News*, by the Rev. A. B. Alexander, Vicar of Chirt, Surrey:”—“Sir,—I was walking over one of the hills of the romantic village of Chirt to-day (Monday), when I was attracted by an object which seemed to be a woman with a striped petticoat, picking up sticks. I approached it with mixed feelings of curiosity and surprise. It turned out to be a beautiful little crimson-and-white oiled silk balloon, half full of a filthy gas. Tied to its mouth were two letters. One was addressed in English, French, and German as follows:—‘To the finder of the ‘Last Hope’ balloon.’ Its enclosures were as follows:—‘Noissy-le-Sec, midnight, January 26th, 1871. To the Finder.—Please oblige an Englishman, compelled by untoward fates to remain in this village with no means of communication with those outside. We expect now shortly the fall of Paris; but as it is important the letter attached to this balloon should somehow reach America, the finder will have my eternal gratitude if he will kindly post it and return the balloon to my agents, Parker and Co., 10, Cheapside, by whom all expenses will be paid. Trusting the finder will do this at once, I remain, for the present here. F. A.’ The Conde de Grannula sends a letter which runs thus:—‘Noissy-le-Sec, midnight.—I write in haste, as I am going to the ramparts. The city is in a state of confusion. The cry of all is for Peace. Jules Favre is hastening to Versailles, there to make the necessary arrangements for peace and await another opportunity to pay those brutal Prus-

sians out and their horrid old king. I send this by a little balloon belonging to a friend of mine, and I trust it will get to England safely. Conde DE GRANNULA.' Of course, the letter alluded to was at once posted and (at the cost of a halfpenny) the balloon despatched to the agent.

— A MILLIONAIRE.—The will of Thomas Brassey, Esq., late of Lowndes-square, contractor for public works, was proved in the London Court. His personalty alone, exclusive of his vast landed estates, amounted to six millions and a half. Of this gigantic, and during the existence of the Court probably unparalleled sum, three millions passed to his children in equal shares, and the remainder was settled in trust to their equal benefit.

8. THE DOWRY TO THE PRINCESS LOUISE.—A crowded public meeting of working men and others was held at the Wellington Music Hall, Brooke-street, Holborn, "to protest against the proposed grant, and to support the withdrawal of all pensions to the German princes." Mr. Lees, compositor, who, in the absence of Mr. George Odger, occupied the chair, said it was the duty of Englishmen to look after their own pockets. He complained of the apathy of the working men, and considered that meetings should have been held long ago to protest against the payment of large sums of money to the royal children. Mr. Horton moved the following resolution:—"That this meeting is of opinion that the time has arrived when it is necessary for the working men to demand the withdrawal of the annuities now paid out of the taxes to German Princes and to English Princesses married to German Princes, and also that no further endowments be made to any of the royal family." Mr. Osborne moved the addition of the words to the resolution, "with the exception of the Princess Louise." He said he did not see why the Princess should be punished because she would marry an Englishman. Princes Teck, Hesse and Christian received grants with their wives. If the Princess had her grant it would not make a difference of half-a-pint of beer to the working man. Let her have the 30,000Z., but it should be distinctly understood that the other Princes should get nothing. Mr. O'Hennessey and Mr. Shipton and others addressed the meeting. The chairman said he wished it to be known that they did not object to the dowry because the Princess was going to marry a Scotchman. They objected to dowries altogether, whether for English, Scotch, or German. The resolution was then carried, with one dissentient. Mr. Weston moved a resolution calling a monster meeting at an early date to elicit the opinions of the working classes, and that in order to carry out the foregoing resolution a petition to Parliament be prepared. He suggested that the meeting should be called in Hyde Park. Mr. Bright seconded the resolution, which was carried. A committee was appointed to carry out the demonstration.

11. CHARGE OF HERESY AGAINST MR. VOYSEY.—The Lord Chancellor read the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the appeal by the Rev. C. Voysey, rector of Healaugh,

against the decision of the Court of Chancery, in the diocese of York, by which he had been condemned on the charge of promulgating doctrines, in a publication entitled, "The Sling and the Stone," contrary to the laws ecclesiastical of the Church of England:—

The distinct charges set forth in this appeal were as follows:—That the appellant had denied the doctrines of the Divinity of Christ and of the Incarnation. That he denied the return of Christ to judge the world, and had expressed himself in derogation of the Holy Scriptures, especially with reference to the Gospel of St. John. In the book in question, the appellant denied that Christ had made any atonement by His death, or had been a mediating sacrifice whereby a reconciliation was brought about for us with the Father. He contended that this was not the case, and that it was the most revolting of all beliefs that Christ suffered in such a way for us.

Their lordships had no hesitation in saying that this was a teaching contrary to the doctrines of the articles and formularies of the Church of England, and that there were not even any authorities by which the appellant's views could be supported. With regard to the statement in the same publication that man was not born in sin, and was not in danger of eternal punishment, their lordships were clearly of opinion that this was also contrary to the articles and formularies aforesaid. Their lordships then referred to the observations in the "Sling and the Stone," with regard to the return of Christ to judge the world, to the effect that if God returned to us in human form after thousands of years it was a proof that He had been absent from His family of mankind for that time, and to believe this was to believe that He was neither the father of man nor his friend. In looking at these observations their lordships had not forgotten the latitude that was allowed to clergy, but they considered that these words could not be held consistent with the opinions contained in the laws ecclesiastical. No society of worshippers could be held together without some fundamental principles, and that it was considered that Christ was God was proved in the fact that He was prayed to as such in the daily morning and evening services of the Church. To hold a contrary opinion was to reject those principles upon which the appellant was admitted into the ministry. They were therefore of opinion that the whole of the charges had been proved, and that sentence of deprivation should be pronounced. Also that the appellant should be condemned in costs. Their lordships, however, thought it desirable, even at this last moment, that an opportunity should be given to him for retraction, and, notwithstanding the appellant had stated his opinion that the principles he had enunciated were not contrary to the doctrines of the Church of England, their lordships were still unwilling to proceed to the last step of their duty until they had given him an option of making a retraction. If he had been present they should have called upon him to do so at once, but as he was absent they

would call upon him within a week to make an unreserved retraction of the errors complained of on pain of their decision being enforced.

Mr. Voysey declined the opportunity thus afforded him of making a retraction, and sent the following letter to the Registrar of the Privy Council :—

MYSELF V. NOBLE.

“Healaugh Vicarage, Tadcaster, February 15, 1871.

“SIR,—I have received through my solicitor a copy of the judgment delivered on the 11th instant by the Lord Chancellor, at the close of which their lordships gave me the opportunity of escaping the penalties of their sentence by expressly and unreservedly retracting the opinions which they have condemned. However anxious I am to acknowledge the kindness of their lordships’ motive in making this offer, it is one for which I cannot pretend to feel grateful, and which every high-minded man would receive with displeasure. Their lordships have carefully avoided meeting my arguments, and have gone out of their way, as it seems to me, to accuse me of misrepresenting and caricaturing the opinions from which I dissent. The rejection of my appeal, for which I was quite prepared, I acquiesce in as just, knowing that nine-tenths of the clergy might, with equal justice, be condemned, without any reply to my arguments, and almost without any attempt to furnish the reasons on which that condemnation was based. When the clergy have had time to examine it, they will find in this ‘judgment’ old fetters renewed, and fresh fetters forged and fastened on their already oppressed minds; and I cannot but look forward with quickened anticipation to that struggle for liberty to be true to one’s convictions which must have ensued whether my appeal had been granted or dismissed. If I feel grateful for any thing, it is that I have been able for eighteen years to sow the seeds of love of truth and liberty in the fields of the Church of England, and that now, before I am finally deprived of my office, another opportunity has been afforded me of ‘expressly and unreservedly’ reaffirming all those opinions which their lordships declare to be contrary to the Thirty-nine Articles, and of rejecting the offer of repurchasing my once cherished position in the Established Church by proclaiming myself a hypocrite. I beg you to communicate this answer to their lordships, and am, sir,

“Your obedient servant, CHARLES VOYSEY.”

15. THE DUKE OF CAMBRIDGE AND HIS CRITICS.—In proposing the toast of “The Army, Navy, and Reserved Forces,” at the annual dinner of the London Orphan Asylum, his Royal Highness said :—“As I have not had an opportunity of saying any thing on the subject for some time, I cannot help remarking incidentally that I have been somewhat perplexed as to why it should be surmised that I am an individual who has been, above all others, opposed to every improvement and every change in the army. It only shows how little one knows of one’s self. I have been living in a fool’s paradise; I have had the impression that I was rather an advanced reformer on army matters, and that, so far from setting myself

against the spirit of the age, I was extremely anxious to go before it. However, I suppose I must have been in error; at least, I am frequently told so now. I am quite prepared to meet any charge of the sort; but I cannot help saying incidentally, in proposing this toast, that I feel as strongly as any man in this room or out of it that the efficiency of the service is the first thing to be considered, and that, in comparison with that, every thing else is of secondary importance. These being my opinions, I hope I shall always be found to encourage, and not to discourage, improvements, which are essential, not only in army matters, but also in every province of life. I am not going to dilate now upon the condition of the army, navy, and reserved forces; as far as they go I trust they are in a very efficient state; and if your liberality and that of Parliament will add to their efficiency, no one will rejoice more than I shall. In the position which I hold I have generally been told to keep down expenditure; and it is, therefore, a novelty to me to hear that the keeping down of expenditure is not so important a matter as it used to be thought. I don't deny that doctrine; I go along with it; but it is a new doctrine; and I am a very ready convert to it. I think it is quite a mistake to imagine that military and naval men are extravagant men; I don't think so, although they may often spend money in a way different from that in which civilians would spend it. A military or a naval man who knows what he is about, and who has only the interest of his country and of his profession at heart, is not given to extravagance: at all events, I do not belong to those who have been schooled in extravagance; and I trust as long as I have the honour of being connected with the services, they will be maintained in such a condition as to do honour to the country and to deserve the good opinion which the people of England have always entertained of them. Subsequently, in responding to the toast of his own health, the Duke of Cambridge said,—In the position in which I am placed I shall endeavour to do my duty, and I beg to assure you I am quite prepared to give a challenge to answer any charge of shortcoming which may be brought against me at any time from any quarter.

16. THE SUN OUTDONE.—On the Thursday night, at 9.8 p.m., a London establishment received a message which had been sent, *visâ* Teheran, from Kurrachee, India, on Friday morning at 12.43 a.m. The message was therefore received in London the day before it was sent from India. The time actually occupied by the message in transmission was fifty minutes; the sun would require four hours and twenty-six minutes to do the same distance, and as the message was sent so soon after midnight, the extraordinary effect was produced of its arriving the previous evening.

17. EXTRAORDINARY ESCAPE OF A PRISONER.—An extraordinary escape from a train was made by a prisoner named Charles Champion, who had been sentenced to seven years' penal servitude for stealing timber from the Great Western Railway Company. Champion, who had a broken leg, was taken to the Windsor station

in custody of a serjeant, walking with the aid of a pair of crutches. They left Windsor by the 4.30 p.m. train. When between Twyford and Reading, Champion drew the serjeant's attention to a spot where, he said, the new line was coming in, pointing to the right hand side of the line. Immediately afterwards the prisoner made a dash at the opposite window, and scrambled through it. The serjeant managed to catch hold of one of his legs, and succeeded in retaining it for some considerable time, while the prisoner was hanging half out of the window. Eventually the prisoner's trousers gave way; the serjeant gave him a jerk in order to prevent him getting under the wheels of the carriage, and he fell on to the ground. At this time the train was travelling at a speed of from twenty to thirty miles an hour. The serjeant contrived to gain the attention of the engine driver, and the train, after it had run about a mile, was stopped. He then got out, and ran a considerable distance along the line, and when about a mile from the spot where the prisoner made his escape, the serjeant saw him being led into a wood by a couple of labourers employed upon the permanent way. He recaptured Champion, and took him on to Reading Gaol, where he safely lodged him at seven o'clock. The prisoner seemed little, if any, the worse for his adventure. It appeared that when apprehended in the first instance he endeavoured to make his escape, and broke his leg by jumping over a wall of considerable height.

— LIBELLING MR. GEORGE AUGUSTUS SALA.—An action for libel against Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton, publishers, of Paternoster Row, came before the Lord Chief Justice at Guildhall. The plaintiff was Mr. G. A. Sala, the well known writer and war-correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph*, and the libel complained of was contained in an article headed "George Augustus Sala," in a volume entitled "Modern Men of Letters Honestly Criticised," and written by Mr. Hain Friswell. The book was dedicated to M. Van de Weyer, the Belgian representative to this country, and it had obtained a large circulation throughout the world. The article described the plaintiff's personal appearance as merry, audacious, and bold—a Bohemian writer of a bad school, but yet a brave man; "one that has done very little good, and yet one full of capabilities for good. A writer of sound English, and a scholar, yet a driveller of tipsy, high-flown nonsense." It went on to state that the plaintiff could sell his pen to describe a Jew clothier's, an advertising furniture-dealer's, a Liverpool draper's, a Manchester hatter's, or a St. Paul's Churchyard bonnet-shop, that he "gets into the hands of the Jews, is often drunken, always in debt, sometimes in prison, and is totally disreputable, living *à tort et à travers* the rules of society." The article also referred to his connexion with Mr. Charles Dickens, Mr. Thackeray, and others, and the *Daily Telegraph*. His writings, as an author and a journalist, were severely criticized. It concluded, "In the meantime reckless writing has produced money recklessly gotten, and it would seem as recklessly distributed, and so far the end which the vicious writer has

aimed at in literature has been answered. A nobler purpose would have achieved a nobler and far higher result." Mr. Sala went into the witness-box and gave a total denial to the personal and other libellous attacks contained in the article, and said it was a pure and unmitigated falsehood. Mr. Charles Dickens, the present conductor of "All the Year Round," and Mr. Edward Levy, one of the proprietors of the *Daily Telegraph* deposed that Mr. Sala's conduct had always been such as they could desire, and that they had never any cause to regret any business arrangements they had had with him. They considered the article exceedingly scurrilous and libellous. The defendant called no witnesses; but Mr. Seymour, who appeared for the defendants, addressed himself to the jury in mitigation of damages. He relied upon the offer of an apology on the part of the defendants, and an assurance that no second edition would be issued. At the same time the learned counsel hinted that certain criticisms on the sensational articles of the *Daily Telegraph* embodied in Mr. Friswell's publication, had had no little to do in instigating the bringing of the action. The jury ultimately returned a verdict for the plaintiff, damages 500*l*.

18. A SHAM FIGHT.—A detachment of troops belonging to the home district were marched out under the command of his Serene Highness Prince Edward of Saxe-Weimar, C.B. The force consisted of the Royal Horse Guards, commanded by Col. Duncan J. Baillie; the 2nd and 3rd batts. Grenadier Guards, commanded by Col. Michael Bruce; the 2nd batt. Coldstream Guards, commanded by Col. C. Baring; and the 2nd batt. Scots Fusilier Guards, commanded by Col. Lord Abinger. They were formed up at Battersea Park, and proceeded to Wimbledon Common, where they were met by the 1st Life Guards, commanded by Col. the Hon. Dudley C. F. de Ros, and 10th Hussars, the latter corps being placed so as to represent the outposts of an army supposed to be advancing from Hampton Court. "If these sham fights are to be profitable (observed an evening paper) the arrangements must be better made than on this occasion. It appears that the sham fight was based on the idea that Kingston-on-Thames was in possession of an enemy who was about to march on London, to prevent which the Household Brigade was sent down to Wimbledon to give battle. The 10th Hussars were out as the outlying piquets of the invading army, they were admirably posted, covering the entire extent of ground from Barnes to Merton—that is, covering all the roads by which a direct advance could be made from Kingston on the south side of the Thames upon London. This being the case, it is hard to believe—as we hear was the case—that the 2nd Life Guards approached the scene of hostilities in close order, that they arrived in presence of the nimble well-trained 10th Hussars without having thrown out any skirmishers, patrols, or advanced guards; whereupon their band was captured, and retained in custody until the enemy considerably let them go. The several battalions of the Guards also, we hear, quietly marched along the main road without advanced guards,

without skirmishers or flanking parties, and without making any use of the numerous minor roads and lanes which lead from the Thames to Wimbledon Common. In short, from what we hear we are led to believe that this grand body of soldiers would have been severely mauled by the 10th Hussars alone, and probably cut to pieces, if this cavalry regiment had really been the advanced body of an army as well trained and as effectively handled as themselves."

20. SALE OF COUNT LAGRANGE'S TWO-YEAR-OLDS. — Messrs. Tattersall submitted for competition at Albert Gate, the valuable two-year-olds bred by Count Lagrange, in France, the lot numbering forty-three. The sale had been announced to take place three weeks previously, but a postponement was rendered necessary in consequence of the difficulty experienced in getting the youngsters to this country from France. The Continental war had been the entire cause of the dispersal of Count Lagrange's immense breeding stud, and the present sale was the first which ever took place in England in which the animals disposed of were all two-year-olds. There was an excellent attendance in the sale-yard, including the majority of the south-country trainers, and several from the north. The muster of the aristocracy was not large, but the sale was a highly satisfactory one, and realized 8685*l.*, showing an average of nearly 207 guineas each.

— A PLURALIST.—The *Times* contained the following:—"At the West Riding Court, at Bradford, the other day, a man of fifty-six years, named Robert Dalby, a schoolmaster, lately residing at Cleckheaton, and possessed of freehold property in that locality, was charged with having, while his lawful wife, Mary Copley, was alive, unlawfully intermarried with three other women. Two months ago the prisoner was committed by the magistrates for a violent assault upon Mary Ann Mortimer, his last unlawful wife, and on his return from prison he was apprehended for the offence of intermarrying with these several women. The prisoner had married no fewer than six times. One of the wives married was dead, and the 'whereabouts' of one could not be found. His lawful wife now living was Mary Copley. She was married to the prisoner at the parish church, Calverley, near Leeds, in the year 1845. The marriage was proved by documentary evidence, and also by witnesses who were present. The marriages of the other three women were proved by documentary evidence, and also by the women themselves. The prisoner was married to Ann Roberts at the Holy Trinity Church, Hulme, Manchester, in April, 1859; to Margaret Scholes at the parish church, Rochdale, on the 11th of March, 1865; and to Mary Ann Mortimer at the parish church, Birstal, near Leeds, in August, 1870. He lived with his lawful wife and also with some of these women for several years, and had children by them. When apprehended and charged with the offence the prisoner stated that 'there was only one honourable marriage in the lot,' and that was 'in the case of the woman from Wales'—Ann Roberts—although this was not true, and he subsequently

stated, with extraordinary coolness, that 'he had been for years seeking an honourable woman to settle down with.'"

21. A BABY HIPPOPOTAMUS was born in the Zoological Gardens, but died three days afterwards. Mr. Frank Buckland thus described the animal:—"Looking through the window of the observatory, I saw the mother lying full length—she is about 12ft. long—with her huge head and enormous mouth flat on the ground; the baby was in a corner lying upon its side, with its nose close to its mother's nose. Whether by design or accident I know not, but the mother has chosen an excellent place for her child, for the corner in which the little thing is lying is formed by the junction of the hot-water pipes, so that this is about the warmest place in the den; the morning sun also falls upon the spot. The baby is about 4ft. long, and would be about 15 inches high when standing up. It is about the size and weight of, and not unlike in general appearance to, a three-score bacon pig; its general colour is a reddish mahogany; the head is very like the head of a calf; the forehead and fore-part of the head appears as if varnished with a black varnish. Imagine a calf's head of india-rubber, and you will have a good idea of the face of the sucking Behemoth. Every now and then it lifts up its head and looks stupidly about; it often wags violently its little rudder-like tail without rising from the straw; it also shakes its ears with the curious jerking motion peculiar to the hippopotamus. I fancy this motion is to throw out any water that may have got into the ears. Mr. Bartlett tells me he has already heard it answer its father's call, but it does not do this often. The mother generally keeps her great starting round eyes shut, but at the least sound, whether a man's voice or the tread of a footstep, she opens her eyes instantly wide as the bull's-eye of a policeman's lantern, and fixes them most intently upon the spot whence the sound proceeds; even if there be no sound she opens her eyes about every minute, and looks intently, with her left eye, at the window from which she is being watched, while her right is steadfastly fixed upon her baby; she also cocks her ears like a horse at any sound. She seems terribly afraid that somebody will come to hurt her baby, over which she keeps such a strict watch and guard. Immediately after her confinement she was excessively savage, and exuded from her skin a profuse perspiration, which poured down her sides, this perspiration being the colour of blood; in fact, as Professor Gulliver has described it, it is really composed of blood corpuscles. She does not seem to require much food. She has every thing that she likes best given her to eat."

Out of eight hippopotami now born in Europe, only one survived its birth for any time. The exception, however, only lived to be the most unfortunate. It was born and reared at Amsterdam, and when it was about a year old it was bought by an American, who, on his way to the far West, deposited it at the Crystal Palace, where it was burnt alive in the fire that took place there about three years since. Fate is evidently against the hippopotami in Europe. It

was said that the mother at the Zoological Gardens appeared to make no effort to suckle her infant; an attempt was made to feed it artificially with milk.

22. MASTER M'GRATH carried off the Waterloo Cup for the third time, a feat which coursing writers unanimously pronounced him incapable of, and stamped himself as the most remarkable greyhound ever put into the slips. With the exception of Cerito, no other greyhound had ever won the great event twice. She, like Master M'Grath, was successful on three occasions; but in her time the entries for the stake only numbered thirty-two instead of sixty-four. Lord Lurgan's famous dog was pupped in February, 1866. He made a successful *début* in Ireland, dividing one or two important stakes; still, when he came out for the Waterloo Cup in 1868, people were hardly prepared to see such a wonder. His speed was terrific, and his cleverness and killing powers equal to it; indeed, he never gave any of his opponents a chance, and defeated Cock Robin (in whose favour Charming May, an own sister and kennel companion, was drawn) very easily in the final course. He did not run again till he came to Altcar for the "blue ribbon" in the following year, when he was again successful. On this occasion he possessed the same whirlwind speed, but he seemed to have lost some of his cleverness; he rushed wildly at his game, and sustained two or three heavy falls in trying to kill. The excitement when he met Bab-at-the-Bowster in the final course was immense; but Ireland proved too much for Scotland, and Mr. Blanshard's little wonder was beaten, after a course which was sufficiently long to thoroughly test the speed and working powers of both dogs.

He was then again laid by for the next Waterloo Cup, and by this time he was considered so invincible that he was actually backed to win at 3 to 1 a fortnight before the meeting commenced. In the first round he was drawn against Lady Lyons, and though she was one of the cracks of the entry, 5 to 2 and 3 to 1 were laid on him. His ignominious downfall is a matter of history—he failed to score a single meritorious point; and, to complete his misfortunes, when the course was over he fell through the thin ice which coated one of the dykes, and would probably have been drowned, but for an enthusiastic Irishman, who plunged in up to his neck to save "the darlint." Lord Lurgan at once drew him for the Purse, and it was understood that he would never run again; indeed, he was used for stud purposes for some little time. However, in the autumn he reappeared at the Lurgan Meeting, and carried off the Brownlow Cup for the second time. Great exception was taken to this performance, and his Waterloo chances were pronounced hopeless. Still the public and all the Irish division stuck to him manfully, and he again started first favourite, but this time at the more reasonable odds of 10 to 1. He showed much of his old speed, and seemed to have regained his cleverness. He was somewhat favoured in having weak hares, and consequently short courses, but his victory was fairly earned and thoroughly deserved.

Her Majesty honoured the dog with a special invitation to Windsor, and on the following day he went to Marlborough House to be inspected by the Prince and Princess of Wales.

—WOMAN SUFFRAGE.—Mrs. Fawcett, wife of Professor Fawcett, M.P., delivered a lecture upon woman suffrage to a crowded audience, comprising a large number of ladies, in the school-room, Upper Grange-road, Bermondsey. Mrs. Fawcett divided her lecture into three headings—the injustice of excluding women from the franchise, the evils resulting from that exclusion, and the objections used against women possessing the franchise. One great illustration of the right of excluding women from the franchise, she said, was the lamentable state of education among them. Many women desired to obtain a medical education, and many women would prefer being attended in their illness by one of their own sex, but every possible obstacle was thrown in the way of this being accomplished. This would not be, however, if women possessed the suffrage. The law denied to married women a legal status in society. She gave several illustrations of the defective and unjust state of the law in this respect. It might be said that the Act lately passed, called the Married Women's Property Bill, would have remedied this evil, but this she denied, and mentioned several points to prove the utter inefficiency of the bill for its object. It was, she contended, one of the most absurd and illogical acts ever passed. As an illustration of this, she said that a married woman who was a sempstress might, under the Act, purchase a sewing-machine out of her savings, and her husband could not touch it; but if any of her friends presented her with such a machine, her husband could take it and sell it, and spend the proceeds upon himself. If women had possessed the suffrage such an imperfect law would not have been passed. In conclusion, Mrs. Fawcett said she claimed no exclusive privileges for women, but that they should stand equal with men before the law.

23. THE CHANNEL FLEET.—The inhabitants of Weymouth and Portland were thrown into a state of great excitement by hearing a very heavy cannonade, which actually made houses shake to their very foundations. Great numbers of people who had retired to rest were aroused from their slumbers, and, hastily dressing, proceeded out of doors to ascertain what was the matter. There was scarcely a house in which the frightened occupants were not outside anxiously inquiring the meaning of the warlike sounds. People were running in all directions to the various points where a view of the Channel Fleet was to be obtained, and on arrival there the mystery was solved; the crews of the various ironclads were at night-quarters. The spectacle was a most brilliant one, flash after flash illuminating the darkness of the night with a brilliancy equal to lightning, while the reports were of a terrific nature. Some very heavy pieces of ordnance were used. This was the first occasion since the Channel Fleet had been at Portland that a beat at night-quarters had taken place.

— **THE PURCHAS CASE.**—The judgment of the Judicial Committee was delivered in the case of Mr. Purchas, accused of heresy. Their Lordships considered that Mr. Purchas had offended against ecclesiastical law by wearing the chasuble, alb, and tunicle during the communion service; by using wine mixed with water and wafer bread in the administration of the communion; and by standing with his back to the people, between the communion-table and the congregation, during the consecration prayer. Charges of wearing a cap called a biretta and of using holy water were not sufficiently proved to enable their lordships to come to a decision; and on these points, therefore, the appeal must be disallowed. As all the charges, except in two comparatively unimportant particulars, had been proved against Mr. Purchas, he must pay the costs in both courts. The judgment was read by the Lord Chancellor. The Archbishop of York, the Bishop of London, and Lord Chelmsford were present.

24. **COLLIERY EXPLOSION.**—The Rhondda Valley, Glamorgan-shire, was again the scene of a dreadful colliery explosion. A few minutes before ten o'clock, a violent shock, accompanied by a loud report, was noticed from the direction of the coal-pit known as the Pentre Pit. Thither the villagers hastened with all possible speed, and seeing the clouds of smoky vapour and dust coming out of the mouth of the shaft, the fearful tale was plainly told that an explosion of fire-damp had taken place. The colliery was the property of Messrs. Cory Brothers and E. S. Kelly, of Cardiff, and 300 men were generally employed in it. As it was the night-shift, however, there was only a comparatively small number of men in the workings—about forty. Efforts were at once made at rescue. For a time it was found quite impossible to make any way into the workings, so overwhelming was the deadly after-damp. William Rosser, the overman of the pit, his son, and another collier named Joseph Davies, were about the first to attempt to penetrate; they had not gone far when they found the sulphur overpowering them. Rosser called to his son and the other young man who were in advance of him to return, but it was too late; they fell dead from suffocation. Rosser narrowly escaped with his life. The damage done to the pit was immense, the workings being shattered in all directions, and the doorways and timbers blown clean away. The state of the atmosphere was so deadly that no hope was entertained of saving any one of the persons who were in the pit at the time.

— **PROFESSOR JOWETT.**—A dinner was given to the Master of Balliol, at the Albion Hotel. The party numbered nearly 200, by far the greater majority being old and present Balliol men. Members of the Bar were more numerous than those of any other of the learned professions. The Dean of Westminster presided, and conspicuous among the company (in addition to the honoured guest of the evening) were the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Secretary of State for War, Mr. R. Browning, and many others. The Chairman proposed the health of the Master of Balliol in a lucid and masterly speech, tracing Professor Jowett's career from a boy at St.

Paul's School and a scholar of Balliol College to his election to a Fellowship while yet an undergraduate, and describing his laborious, successful, and unselfish tutorial and professional functions for so many years. He traced the origin of the literary pre-eminence of Balliol College in the University first to the discreet discipline and selection of tutors by Dr. Jenkyns when Master. The Dean's speech was received with rapturous applause. The Master of Balliol replied to the toast with considerable emotion. He recounted the happy intimacy which had subsisted between himself and the Dean for thirty-four years, during which time they had explored together abroad and fought literary and controversial battles at home, and worked side by side in college duties of the highest educational order. He concluded by addressing himself exclusively to his old pupils, adjuring them to exercise Christian kindness and forbearance towards all who came within their sphere.

MARCH.

2. NEWSPAPER ENTERPRISE.—One of the greatest (perhaps the greatest) feats of newspaper reporting and special despatch by land and sea was achieved this week by the *Times*. Dr. Russell, the well-known war-correspondent, and Mr. Kelly, of the *Times* staff, were the reporters of the entry of the Germans into Paris. Dr. Russell rode into Paris on Wednesday morning (1st March) with the Prussian troops, and he and Mr. Kelly left Paris by special train of the Northern Railway at 2.50 p.m. that day, and arrived at Calais at 9.30. Thence a special steam-packet conveyed the despatches across to Dover, and they proceeded by special train to London. The courier reached the *Times* office and delivered his despatches at 1.15 a.m. Thursday, and the whole of the report of those special correspondents was published in the regular first edition of the *Times* on Thursday morning.

7. SALE OF WHITE'S.—The sale of the freehold of White's Club-house, St. James's-street, at the Auction Mart, City, attracted a large attendance, and considerable competition was manifested. As an investment, it appeared that the rental was 2100*l.* per annum for eleven years, when the lease to the club was to expire. The sum realized was 46,000*l.*, the purchaser being Mr. H. W. Eaton, M.P. It was at first supposed that the club had secured the premises in which they have been so long located, but this did not appear to be the case, Mr. Eaton having purchased the property for investment.

10. FIRE AT HOLKER HALL.—Holker Hall, one of the seats of the Duke of Devonshire, near Ulverstone, was almost totally

destroyed by fire. The fire was first discovered early in the morning by Lord Frederick Cavendish, who was awakened by what he thought was the noise of a table falling. He hastily arose, and noticing that the table in his dressing-room was on fire, he raised an alarm. The flames spread rapidly, and the people of Ulverstone early saw indications of a fire in the direction of the hall. The fire-engine and brigade left Ulverstone by the regular train, and an engine was despatched from Barrow by special train, accompanied by a large crowd of people, anxious to render assistance in extinguishing the flames.

The library was destroyed, and all but a few of the valuable collection of paintings.

The Duke of Devonshire was himself staying at the hall. He was very anxious to save one painting of great value, and this was accomplished by cutting it out of the frame, the latter being too large to be passed through the windows.

A considerable portion of the furniture was saved.

Of the pictures, exclusive of rare prints, &c., seventy-two were destroyed. These were distributed in various parts of the wing which was burnt, in the following manner:—In the library, portraits of Sir Thomas More, Sir Isaac Newton, Hobbes, the philosopher, the first Duke of Devonshire, by Sir Godfrey Kneller, and a portrait supposed to be that of the Duchess of Manchester. In the drawing-room, besides some minor pictures, a "Windmill" by Jacob Ruysdael, a small landscape by Claude, "Calm at Sea" by Horace Vernet, two sea-views by Vandervelde, a very beautiful "Venice" by Canaletto, "St. Christopher and the Saviour" by Albert Durer, two pictures by Wouvermans, three by Zuccarelli, and two by Hobbema, as well as a fine portrait of John Bunyan. In the ante-room—"A Gentleman" by Tintoretto, acknowledged to be one of the finest of this master's works; "Raising the Stones of the Sepulchre" (artist unknown), and a portrait of Lady Dorothy, daughter of the Earl of Southampton, with two or three others of less importance. In the front hall, in addition to the magnificent old fireplace, of the date of 1614, there were destroyed portraits of Admiral Penn, Mary, Queen of William III., Lady Rachel Russell, Sir William Lowther, the Lord-Keeper Coventry, and one of the Earls of Douglas. In the corridor—"Truth and Daylight," a fine picture, with portrait of the first Lord George Cavendish, and portraits of Sir James Lowther, William III., Louis XIV., the Duke of Marlborough, James II., Mrs. Knott, Mr. Preston, Mr. Baxter, and the well-known portrait of Nell Gwynne by Sir P. Lely, with a few more family pictures, principally of the portrait class, were burnt. On the grand staircase the following were destroyed:—"St. James's Palace and the Green Park in the Olden Time," "Barrow-in-Furness in 1846 and in 1870," "Furness Abbey in the Olden Time," "The Artists at Study," "Caught in the Act," "John the Baptist," "Bridge in Naples," "The Mistletoe," "View in Florence," a very large picture; portraits of Cardinal Pole, Mary, Queen of England,

Elizabeth, Duchess of Devonshire, the Princess Sophia (supposed), Charles I. (a very fine likeness of life-size), the first Duchess of Devonshire (daughter of James, Duke of Ormonde), Henrietta Maria, Queen of Charles I.; Lady Rachel Russell, William, second Duke of Devonshire; his son, Lord Charles Cavendish; his daughter, afterwards Lady Betty Lowther; and the two daughters of Lady Rachel Russell, who afterwards became respectively Duchess of Devonshire and Duchess of Rutland, a few small landscapes, "The Ascension," magnificently executed in mosaic work, and a fine picture by Gainsborough, containing portraits of the Duke's father and uncle as children. Besides the pictures, a large quantity of beautiful tapestry, brought from Lismore Castle, the Duke's seat in Ireland, and some remarkably fine oak carvings removed from the Old Priory Church, Cartmel, at the time of its renovation, were destroyed, as well as a valuable collection of rare antique china, &c., which was scattered about the staircase and corridor. Among the curiosities burnt was a very remarkable old oaken bedstead, whose curious carving, of the finest workmanship had been generally admired.

Holker Hall was the family mansion of the Prestons in the reign of Queen Elizabeth; from them it passed to the Lowthers, and then to the Cavendish family.

13. "PUNCH" AT DOVER.—The Dover Young Men's Christian Association engaged themselves in discussing whether *Punch* should lie upon the table of the reading-room. About forty members were present, of whom 28 voted—the numbers being for the retention of *Punch* 13, against 15. The motion for the presence of *Punch* in the reading-room was therefore declared to be negatived. The president (the Rev. W. R. Mowll) triumphantly produced a back number of *Punch*, containing a humorous illustration of an old lady imparting to a sympathizing friend the fact that, although she permitted Jemima the cook to go to chapel three times a day, she discharged her duties in the kitchen no better, arguing that this was a sneer at religion. The Rev. H. P. Hughes, in replying to this observation, said he had no doubt that the old lady was a staunch supporter of the State Establishment, and intended to show the demoralizing influence of chapels. Several other speakers took part in the debate, and the best of the argument lay with the advocates of *Punch*, although their opponents managed to command the greater number of votes.

16. "THE BISHOP OF BOND-STREET."—The death of Mr. William Bishop (gun-maker) took place at 170, New Bond-street, where he had resided for fifty years in the capacity of agent to Mr. Westley Richards, of Birmingham. The deceased, who was in his seventy-fourth year, was a remarkable character in his day. It was his delight to converse with men of letters and other distinguished characters, by whom he was much respected; and until the last few weeks, when weakness produced by gout had compelled him to retire to his room, he was at times as cheerful and as full of fun as ever.

Although members of the royal family and other persons of distinction were accustomed to attend his levées—which were usually held between four and five o'clock in the afternoon, and to which none but a privileged few were admitted—he never forgot himself. Unlike Sir Pertinax Macsycophant, he always stood straight in the presence of a great man, yet it was said he never contradicted a gentleman in his life. His powers of persuasion were great, and it was quite a treat to see him when in the act of disposing of a rifle or a pair of guns. He had sufficient influence to cause a Bill for the prevention of dog-stealing to pass the Lords and Commons some fifteen years ago, and he was most desirous for the Legislature to introduce a measure to prevent partridge-shooting commencing until September 14th. To accomplish this object he had a petition prepared, and to this several important signatures were obtained; but the intimation that the then Government would probably declare game private property induced him to forego the task he had set himself. He scarcely ever interfered with politics, as he used to say that nearly all politicians were alike when they got into power. The Duke of Wellington and other notables always spoke of him as “the Bishop of Bond-street,” by which title he had been known for years—in fact, his letters were invariably so addressed; and there was scarcely a cabman in London but knew “the bishop” by repute if not by sight, in proof of which may be mentioned that about twelve years since a clergyman from the country hailed a cab and told the driver to take him to the Bishop of London’s residence. After a short ride the cab was stopped in front of 170, New Bond-street, and it was not until then that the cabman discovered his mistake.

17. EARTHQUAKES IN LANCASHIRE.—A slight shock of earthquake was felt in the north of England. In and near Manchester the shock was felt soon after eleven o'clock. Testimony to the fact was given by many people, but most of them described it as producing only a slight, though perceptible tremor.

At Singleton Brook, near Manchester, the first shock was felt at precisely six minutes to eleven. A resident said that the windows of his house were violently shaken, as though a heavy vehicle were passing along the road. Several inmates of the house remarked the effect as peculiar, but it did not then suggest the idea of an earthquake, and had nothing further occurred the impression produced would have been forgotten. About five minutes past eleven, however, the noise was again heard, accompanied as before, by a tremulous motion. This time the effect was much more marked and continuous. All the inmates of the house (nine in number) were in bed, and each felt the shock. At first the impression produced was merely that of trembling, which lasted, for, perhaps, two seconds. This was succeeded by a slight pause of about half a second, and then the beds were distinctly felt to roll from side to side, exactly like the heaving of a ship at anchor, and with the same sharp and sudden check to the motion. The time

occupied by the second shock was about four seconds. Immediately before the first shock a heaviness in the atmosphere had been noticed, as if there were a sudden change in the temperature. A similar effect was produced, according to concurrent testimony, in the neighbourhood of Bowden.

A decided shock was experienced at Leeds, and from accounts received from York, Wakefield, Doncaster, and other places, it was pretty generally felt over the southern part of Yorkshire. The accounts obtained from a variety of sources in Leeds show that it was felt in nearly every part of the borough. The statements varied slightly as to the exact time of the occurrence, but it must have taken place from eleven to a quarter-past. There were two motions, the first being very slight—so slight that no notice would probably have been taken, but for a more decided one which followed, and the result of which was that windows were violently shaken in their frames, and in some houses articles of crockery displaced.

Some persons at Leeds spoke of it as a rumbling underground noise; others as a rapid shaking of the earth, followed by a sound like a dull crack; others as a sharp swaying, oscillating motion, as if a heavy-laden waggon were passing; and one “as if a huge animal were shaking itself.” In the North the impression was that a colliery explosion had occurred. Many persons were aroused from their slumber, and imagined they had been favoured with a visit from thieves. Several cases were mentioned in which the inmates searched their houses, being under the impression that the extraordinary noise was caused by burglars.

On the night of the 22nd, again, from half-past ten till a quarter-past eleven o’clock, a strange rumbling noise, accompanied by a slightly oscillating motion, was heard in several parts of North and West Lancashire. The sensation experienced was akin to that felt on the previous night, but it was not so intense nor so generally recognized, though it was much more varied in effect. At Preston some persons heard deep, heavy sounds, and felt a slow wave-like motion of the earth. The sounds and the motion were repeated many times for three-quarters of an hour, and were quite distinct enough to excite and alarm several persons. There were also observed pale flashes of lightning, which were succeeded by dull, slow reverberations, as if proceeding from distant thunder-claps. The wind changed about twenty times, shifting rapidly in all directions during the period named, and occasionally drops of rain fell. The northern sky was clear and starry, while the firmament in the opposite direction was dull and cloudy. In the Fylde of Lancashire, a heavy booming sound, accompanied by partial oscillation of the earth, was noticed. One who observed it said, “The sound seemed to come from a number of guns at a distance—as if they were being fired rapidly; and we thought it was produced by some shooting party until we bethought ourselves of the hour—eleven o’clock at night—which dissipated that notion.” There was a tremulousness of the earth observed, but neither the course it took

nor the current of the atmospheric commotion could be accurately defined.

— WRECK OF THE “QUEEN OF THE THAMES.”—The “Queen of the Thames” struck heavily on a rock while going at a great pace under steam and sail, and became a total wreck. Just two months before our friends in Sydney were in ecstasy at the quick passage made by this magnificent vessel. She had accomplished the run from London to Sydney in fifty-eight days, detentions included. The Cape route had been taken for the voyage, and the quickness of the passage as actually accomplished seemed almost incredible. Every body connected with the ship sounded her praises, and her captain and officers, including one of her proprietors, were received in the colony with something like a public triumph. The Cape route was thought to have been established in favour by the wonderful performance of the “Queen of the Thames,” and when she took her departure for her homeward voyage, with a high officer of the colony on board, hopes had blossomed into certainties, and the consummation was believed to be accomplished. Within a month from that day the ship was a helpless wreck.

The vessel left Melbourne for London on Saturday, February 18, and struck the ground on March 18. She had just reached the Cape of Good Hope, having been sighted on the twenty-sixth day out, up to which time every thing had gone well. At first she was kept off the land a little, but in the night of the 17th, being, as was supposed, some distance from the shore, she stood on “at a spanking rate, under steam and sail.” Exactly at 1.20 a.m. she was felt to strike heavily, and “all attempts to back her off proved fruitless,” owing to the force with which she had struck. As the day dawned it was found she had beached herself on a spit of sand, not far from Cape Agulhas, and there she remained firmly imbedded. Happily the weather was fine, and the sea tolerably smooth, so that no immediate danger was to be apprehended, and it was resolved, no doubt judiciously, to wait with patience for daylight. Meantime the boats were got ready, and as soon as the sun rose the passengers and crew, to the number of 315 souls, were safely landed. In an attempt afterwards made to save the ship’s papers a boat was capsized, and four seamen drowned, but so far as regards the wreck the sacrifice was confined to a splendid vessel and a precious cargo. The popularity of the ship, indeed, was sufficiently shown by her freight. She carried a hundred first-class and as many second-class passengers, and had on board 2500 bales of wool, 12,000 bags of copper ore, a large quantity of preserved meats, and 7000*l.* worth of gold dust.

20. ARRIVAL OF THE EMPEROR NAPOLEON.—Dover was the scene on this date of an incident that will take a prominent place in history—the meeting, after an eight months’ separation, of the Emperor Napoleon, the Empress Eugenie, and the Prince Imperial. The day was unusually fine, and thousands of people had assembled on the pier to witness the arrival of the illustrious exile. The

Empress Eugenie, with the Prince Imperial and a limited suite, arrived at Dover by a special train from Chiselhurst, and at once proceeded to the Lord Warden Hotel, where she stayed until, at about twenty minutes to two o'clock, the special boat from Ostend was sighted. Her Majesty and the Prince, with Prince Murat, Prince Jerome Bonaparte, and others, then walked down to the pier, followed by many ladies and gentlemen, and stood on one of the landing stages. It had been arranged that the boat with the Emperor on board should be brought alongside the pier, but through the Belgian officials in Dover neglecting to hoist the usual signal flag, Captain Dufour steamed into the harbour. There was then at once a regular stampede on the part of the crowd, which had now assumed vast proportions, and a rush was made for the quay. By the time the steamer had got to her moorings, the people had reached the harbour. The Emperor, with Baron Hekren, General Fleury, and Prince Achille Murat, stood on the deck, and was immediately recognized. Cheer after cheer burst forth from the assembled multitude, and the Emperor acknowledged the warm greetings of the crowd with smiles and salutes. As he stepped on shore, Mr. William Henry Payn, the borough coroner in Dover, approached the Emperor and said, "As Mayor of Dover I received your Majesty on the occasion of your visit to England fifteen years ago, and I now repeat my salutations." The Emperor smiled, made some pleasant remark to the Coroner, and began to walk towards the railway terminus of the South-Eastern Railway. The cheering continued, and it was very difficult for the Emperor to make his way through the crowd. He had only gone a few yards before several policemen cleared a way before him. In another minute he had clasped in his arms the Empress Eugenie, who passionately kissed him several times, and who, with her eyes full of tears, then put both her hands on his arm, while the young Prince, who had taken hold of his father's hand, saluted him on both cheeks. The crowd pressed so closely round the illustrious exiles that they were almost lifted from their feet. The gentlemen who accompanied them, however, promptly came to their rescue, and, with the aid of one or two policemen, formed a cordon, and the Imperial family walked, slowly enough—for the roadway was blocked with men and women, all anxious to catch sight of them—towards the Lord Warden Hotel. Several times a stoppage was necessary, and a passage had to be made by the police; but at length the Lord Warden Hotel was reached, and the Emperor and Empress struggled through the crowd, and got safely inside the hotel. The cheering never ceased for a moment, the people appeared wild with excitement, and from the windows of the houses handkerchiefs and hats were waved, while shouts of "*Vive l'Empereur*" and "*Vive l'Impératrice*" were frequently heard. The Empress seemed to be half-frightened, half-pleased; but the Emperor, always smiling, even when pushed about as the crowd swayed, continually bowed and lifted his hat. The imperial refugees only stayed at the Lord Warden Hotel a few

minutes. The special train was in readiness at the South Eastern station, and at twenty minutes past two o'clock they left the Lord Warden Hotel by the private corridor, so that the people outside did not see them. There were, however, two or three hundred ladies and gentlemen inside the station, and as the Emperor walked down the platform he was again loudly cheered. The Empress was presented with three beautiful bouquets, and, with the Emperor and Prince, entered a saloon carriage. After a great deal of hand-shaking and hand-kissing, and more vociferous cheering, the train moved away.

The Emperor had much altered in appearance, but looked in good health. His hair and moustache were quite grey. Both he and the Empress were evidently much affected by the warmth of their reception.

The same number of the *Times* that reported this event described the triumphal entry of the new Emperor of Germany into Berlin.

21. MARRIAGE OF THE PRINCESS LOUISE.—The marriage of the Princess Louise, fourth daughter of her Majesty, to John George Edward Henry Douglas Sutherland Campbell, Marquis of Lorne, eldest son of the Duke of Argyll, was solemnized at St. George's Chapel, Windsor, with great pomp. The morning broke very miserably, and as little like "Queen's weather" as could be, but by ten o'clock had settled into a lovely spring day. About half an hour later the Eton boys mustered to the number of nearly nine hundred at the place allotted to them on the Castle Hill. At twenty minutes past eleven o'clock about two hundred guests arrived at the Great Western Station, and this, for those who had not the privilege of entering the chapel, was one of the chief events of the morning. The station was charmingly decorated, carpeted, and draped, and hot-house flowers and evergreens banked with a liberal and tasteful hand. The engine of the train bore as emblem of its important mission a large crown affixed to the funnel. The Queen's carriages and servants, and a number of hired conveyances, awaited the arrival of the guests, and took them direct to the chapel.

The Duke and Duchess of Argyll, on their way to the private entrance of the Castle, were promptly observed and pointed out. A tribute of admiration in the shape of a chorus of murmurs was paid to the brawny Highlander, kilted, and wearing a tall feather in his bonnet, who sat with the duke's driver. He was a magnificent specimen of his race, and his counterpart was to be seen in the drum-major of the Highlander's band. After the last of her Majesty's guests arriving by train had entered Castle Yard, the police formed a wall across the road and shut off communication with the town. In the midst of the dust and confusion caused by this movement a carriage was observed coming slowly from the Queen's entrance, and the cry of "The bridegroom" was raised. He bowed his acknowledgments of the smiles and bows and applause he received, and it was said he looked pale and seemed nervous. In the silence which followed this break in the waiting, a woman beyond the crowd in a

bye street was heard singing, of all songs in the world for such a day, "Ye banks and braes;" but the rapid time of the musician made it apparent that she selected it as a particularly gleesome composition.

The officers of the Household came in six carriages. The bridesmaids, who had been much "wanted," somehow found their way to the chapel unobserved from without. A five minutes' interval ensued before another escort appeared on the brow of the slope, and the bride and her Queen mother now claimed undivided notice. The vigorous cheering of the Eton boys was taken up along the line, and re-echoed from the bottom of the street before the carriage had turned into Castle Yard. The Princess, like her Majesty, bowed repeatedly, the former, through the window, appearing as if looking out from a bower of orange blossoms. They disappeared within the chapel, as the others had done, leaving wet eyes, agitated hearts, and whispers of "God bless 'her'" amongst the thousands of spectators.

The scene in the chapel when the guests had taken their places was excessively grand. Every gentleman was in full uniform, and most were glittering with gold lace and stars and orders. There was a great diversity in the dresses of the ladies, both in material and colour, from velvet to gauzy silk, and from deep maroon to the palest pink and blue.

The first of the wedding-party to arrive was the Duke of Argyll, with his family. His Grace came in "the garb of old Gaul," with kilt, philibeg, sporran, and claymore complete, and the green Campbell scarf across his shoulders, over which was also suspended the Order of the Thistle. He was accompanied by the Duchess of Argyll, who wore a dress of cloth of silver and white satin, by the Dowager Duchess in violet satin, Lord Archibald and Lord Colin Campbell, Lady Campbell, and Lady Percy, who sat in order upon the right hand fauteuils; his Grace alone remaining standing. Then the choirs gradually fill. The Lord Chancellor, in wig and gown, walks up the centre aisle, accompanied by Lord Halifax in diplomatic uniform of blue and gold, and both take their seats in stalls to the left of the altar. Considerable curiosity is roused as to the identity of a handsome, stalwart figure in full Highland costume, down to the quaint drab wrappings about the feet, which Scotchmen know to be *en règle*, but which to the uneducated eye resemble bathing shoes. Then the word goes round that this is Mr. Campbell, of Islay, the brother of the Countess of Granville, who is arrayed in his tartan, and who is afterwards seen to seat himself below the Duke of Roxburghe, who himself sits between the Duke of Northumberland and the Duke of Richmond. All these noblemen are in military or diplomatic uniform, and all wear their orders. Keeping still to the left side of the choir, the eye lights upon a tiara of brilliants, which is so exceptionally magnificent, even amid the profusion of precious gems which are glittering on every side, that the question arises as to who is the fair patrician in blue velvet—its

wearer. It is the Marchioness of Westminster, and next to her is her husband, the marquis, who is in a military uniform, and whose stall is nearest to the altar. Her Majesty did not enter her stall, but remained during the whole ceremony at her daughter's side.

Shortly before half-past twelve o'clock, the first procession was marshalled in the nave by Garter King at Arms (Sir Albert Woods), with gold-encrusted coat, bearing the proper blazonry. Under his superintendence, assisted by Somerset Herald (Mr. J. R. Planché) and Chester Herald, in their old-time robes, no time was lost in arranging the *cortége*. As it entered the choir the organ, which had previously played a festal march composed by the organist (Dr. Elvey), now, with louder, bolder strains, burst forth into a march by Handel (from "Joseph"). All rose as the procession entered, and watched its progress with eagerness. After the officers of state came the Count von Seckendorff, representing the household of their Imperial Highnesses the Imperial Prince and Princess of Germany. Then came an Eastern Prince, English by residence and choice, his Highness Maharajah Duleep Singh. Her Highness the Maharanee wore a reddish veil of exquisite fabric, which covered the head, without, however, concealing the face, and fell over the shoulders and body, disclosing a skirt which shone as though of veritable cloth of gold. His Highness wore a jewelled turban of lustrous white, with a coat of dull blue. The Maharajah also wore the Riband and Order of the Star of India, and his appearance with the Maharanee in the procession, her dress a compromise between Eastern and Western fashions, created some sensation. The Prince of Saxe Weimar followed, with the Prince and Princess of Teck, her Royal Highness in a dress of dark blue satin, and the Prince wearing the light blue uniform of a cavalry officer in the Austrian service. The Duke of Cambridge, in Field-Marshal's uniform, leading her Royal Highness the Duchess of Cambridge, came next, and close behind were the Count of Flanders, Prince Arthur in the dark uniform of the Rifle Brigade, and Prince Leopold, who, in compliment to the bridegroom, wore the kilt. Princess Beatrice came next, in high spirits, wearing a pink satin dress, her light hair hanging freely behind. Then came Prince Christian, in the scarlet uniform of a major-general in the English service, with the Princess, in pink satin. Then the two little children of the Prince and Princess of Wales, Prince George of Wales and Prince Albert Victor, in Highland kilt, scarf, and sporran; cheery, bright boys, who might well gladden a mother's heart, as they march along, more or less solemnly, in front of her. The Princess of Wales, bowing to all, and greeted with an almost affectionate greeting by all, was the last of the royal party. A cloud of ladies and gentlemen in waiting closed this grand procession, which ranged itself, or was arranged, in proper position before the altar.

For awhile the organ ceases, and presently the bridegroom, preceded by the Vice-Chamberlain and supported by his "best men," walks up the choir and takes up his position on the right of the

altar. The Marquis of Lorne did not wear the kilt, but the uniform of the Argyllshire regiment of Volunteer Artillery, of which he is colonel. Lord Percy and Lord Ronald Leveson-Gower wore corresponding uniforms. It was a trying position for the bridegroom, but he bore it well. Standing in front of the Duke and Duchess of Argyll, a little in advance of his supporters, his fair hair and clearly-cut features, which photography had made so familiar, were full in view from all parts of the choir.

Another interval of suspense, and then, looking into the nave, the bridesmaids are seen leaving the little chapel where they had been in waiting. They go out through the western gateway to meet the bride; and cheers and music from without tell those inside the chapel that the moment is approaching of all others the most impatiently expected. A crimson curtain concealing the door-way is soon drawn aside; the procession appears, headed by the heralds, the Lord Chamberlain, and the Vice-Chamberlain; and the organ peals forth Mendelssohn's Wedding March from "*Athalie*." Slowly the procession advances up the nave, and enters the choir. The bride is supported on the right by the Queen and on the other side by the Prince of Wales and the Duke of Saxe-Coburg and Gotha. Once more all rise and make low obeisances as the bridal *cortège* sweeps by. The Princess looked naturally somewhat pale and agitated, and her eyes were bent on the ground. But, in her array of white satin and veil of Honiton lace she looked a charming bride, and excited the warmest interest and admiration as she passed by. The Queen wore a black satin dress, relieved by the broad blue Riband of the Garter, and by a fall of white lace, which reached nearly to the ground, and materially tempered, though it did not conceal, the dark material beneath. The Duke of Saxe-Coburg wore the white uniform of an Austrian officer; the Prince of Wales that of the 10th Hussars, of which he is colonel.

Immediately upon entering the chapel her Majesty extended her hand to the Prince of Wales, who bowed and kissed it, and then took his position upon one side, while the Duke of Saxe-Coburg did likewise on the other. Very slow and stately was the progress of this grand procession. The patrician maidens who played their part as the friends and supporters of the bride, were dressed in white satin decorated with red camelias, with long and drooping leaves; and the bride wore a white satin robe, with a tunic of Honiton lace of ingenious and graceful design. In this tunic were bouquets composed of the rose, the shamrock, and the thistle, linked together by a floral chain, from which hung bouquets of various flowers. Her Royal Highness's train and handkerchief were also trimmed with Honiton lace, while her veil was of the same choice material. A special interest attached to it from the fact of its having been worked from a sketch made by her Royal Highness the Princess Louise herself. Its leading ornament was a bouquet of roses, surrounded by lighter flowers—such as orange blossoms, myrtle, jasmine, and myosotis; the general effect being exceedingly rich and beautiful.

The bridegroom stands motionless, his head turned from the altar to the bridal procession, from which he never lifts his eyes. Her Majesty, who looks the picture of health, bows her acknowledgments on both sides, for the whole company has risen, and a mighty rustling of silk mingles with the clank of swords as its members render their homage to their Sovereign.

Arrived at the altar, the bride's procession became incorporated with those which had preceded it, and the position of the distinguished personages occupying the seats of state upon the *haut-pas* before the altar became more defined. These seats were arranged in semicircular form, and within this semicircle, and closer to the altar rails, stood the bride and bridegroom; the Queen, the Prince of Wales, and the Duke of Saxe-Coburg being a few paces behind Princess Louise; Lord Percy and Lord Ronald Gower occupying the same relative position to the Marquis of Lorne. While the "Wedding March" was still being played, Lord Sydney distributed to the party on the dais, books of the marriage-service richly bound in crimson velvet. Then the service began, the two psalms being admirably chanted by the choir to a double chant by Dr. Elvey. During the ceremony the sun shone brightly through the stained windows. The service was read by the Bishop of London, in not too distinct a voice. As for the question, "Wilt thou have this woman to be thy wedded wife?" and the interesting questions and responses which follow, not one word said by either bride or bridegroom could be heard at the end of the choir; and as the silence at the time was almost painful, it may be easily surmised that both the Princess and the Marquis must have spoken in the faint whispers common to those who thus plight their troth. To the bishop's question, "Who giveth this woman to be married to this man?" the Queen replied by a gesture, and the bishop then joined their hands. The declarative sentence which each repeats, "I, Princess Louise, take thee, John Douglas Sutherland, Marquis of Lorne," was as inaudible as all that had gone before. When the ring was put on, the bells pealed, the guns fired, and gave notice to the world without that the ceremony had been happily celebrated. The Bishop of Winchester read the short address to the newly-married couple, setting forth the duties of man and wife, and his clear distinct voice was heard with fine effect in every part of the choir. Before the blessing, a chorus, by Beethoven, was sung by the choir. Then, the ceremony being ended, the Queen gave her daughter a loving kiss, and the bridegroom, bending low, kissed her Majesty's hand. The organ again pealed forth a march by Handel, and then the bride took her husband's arm, and walked with a bright and happy face out of the church, the processions otherwise following in the same order in which they had entered. The Duke and Duchess of Argyll remained for some moments on the *haut-pas* receiving the congratulations of their friends.

After the ceremony, and while on their way from St. George's Chapel to the Castle, the royal bride and bridegroom were greeted

with prolonged cheering. Her Majesty and the Princess of Wales were also very warmly received.

The royal wedding breakfast was served at a quarter past two o'clock in the magnificent Oak Room, covers being laid for about sixty guests. The company present included their Royal Highnesses the Prince and Princess of Wales, Prince Arthur, Duke and Duchess of Cambridge, Prince and Princess Teck, the Duke of Saxe-Coburg, Prince and Princess Christian, &c. Another breakfast for the general company was served in the Waterloo Gallery.

Shortly after four o'clock the newly-married pair left the Castle for Claremont. An open carriage and four greys, with one outrider, was prepared for the Marquis of Lorne and Princess Louise, and another equipage for Lord Mountcharles and Lady Churchill. There was also an escort of the 2nd Life Guards. As the bride and bridegroom left the Castle, their numerous relatives, including the Princes and Princesses of the royal family, showered over them a quantity of white satin slippers; and, following an ancient Highland custom, a new broom was thrown after them as they got into the carriage.

The cavalcade drove slowly down the Castle Hill, along High-street and Park-street. The balconies and windows were thronged with spectators, who cheered enthusiastically, the ladies waving their handkerchiefs. The grand avenue of the Long Walk was for nearly a mile continuously lined with sightseers. The Princess, who wore a white bonnet and white silk dress, seemed to have regained her usual cheerfulness and good spirits, and acknowledged the greetings of the crowd with cordial *empressement*. The Marquis raised his hat from time to time, but appeared, with great good taste, to desire that his fair young bride should be the sole object of the popular demonstration.

Princess Louise and the Marquis of Lorne arrived at Esher precisely at six o'clock, and were received with great enthusiasm. At Bear Green a triumphal arch was erected, at which an address was read by the vicar on behalf of the villagers, and a bouquet of white camellias and orange blossoms presented by the daughter of the High Sheriff. After the enthusiastic cheering which followed the presentation had subsided, during which her Royal Highness several times rose and graciously bowed, she said, in a very distinct voice:—

"I thank you very much, on Lord Lorne's part and my own, for your very kind and loyal expressions," and then gave the following further reply:—"I receive with pleasure the kind welcome of the inhabitants of Esher, who are the first to testify their good wishes to me since my marriage. I beg to express, on Lord Lorne's part and my own, our great sense of your kindness, and to thank you very sincerely for extending to me the same good feeling which for many years you have shown to members of my family at Claremont." Amid great cheering the royal couple then proceeded through the triumphal arch on their way to Claremont.

24. THE LONDON DEMOCRATS.—A crowded public meeting was held at the Hall of Science, Old-street, St. Luke's, for the purpose

of considering the propriety of establishing a Republican Club in London. About 1500 persons were present, mainly consisting of working-men. Mr. Austin Holyoake occupied the chair. Mr. Charles Bradlaugh delivered an address explanatory of the principles of Republicanism. He spoke of the general spread of Republican ideas throughout the country, and maintained that dissatisfaction with monarchy was permeating all classes of the people, except those interested in upholding the present system. The almost total abstinence of the present sovereign from public affairs, and the small hope entertained that the probable successor to the throne would be of the slightest use or advantage to the people, had largely tended to this feeling. He had just returned from a tour through the country, and he had found that in Birmingham, Newcastle, Nottingham, and many other large towns, Republican clubs had been formed, comprising thousands of members. He went on to maintain that the establishment of Republican societies was perfectly legal, justifying his statement by a reference to former State trials, and proceeded to show that the present time was the right and proper time for the formation of Republican clubs. He did not desire the establishment of these clubs for the purpose of overthrowing the existing monarchy, but as the best and most legitimate means of educating the people in the principles of Republicanism. His idea of a Republic was that the whole people should govern, and that under it the whole people should know how to govern. He concluded a speech lasting nearly two hours by moving the following resolution:—"That in the opinion of this meeting it is desirable to establish a Republican Club in London." Several speakers having supported the resolution in strong Republican speeches, the resolution was carried with three dissentients amidst great cheering. A large number of members was enrolled, and the proceedings concluded with a vote of thanks to the chairman, and three cheers for the Universal Republic.

25. A CENTENARIAN.—John Jenkins, of Coddington, near Ledbury, Herefordshire, died at the extraordinary age of 107 years. The deceased lived with his daughter, now about eighty-five years of age, in a small mud hut near Coddington-Cross, and was formerly a farm-labourer. The deceased was in possession of all his faculties up to the time of his death. He freely indulged in the habit of smoking.

29. OPENING OF THE ROYAL ALBERT HALL.—Her Majesty the Queen opened the Royal Albert Hall of Arts and Sciences, in presence of the members of the royal family, the chief officers of State, and a large concourse—about 8000—of distinguished and fashionable people. The ceremony was brief, but very imposing. Soon after eleven o'clock, an hour before the time for the arrival of the Queen, the Hall seemed nearly full; and as the time went on the arrivals multiplied. Statesmanship, science, art, and fashion were largely represented. The members of the provisional committee, twelve in number, met the Prince of Wales, their President,

at the north entrance, and at the appointed hour, half-past twelve, the Queen arrived. On her entrance the whole of the vast audience rose to receive her, and remained standing while orchestra and organ joined in the National Anthem, and the royal procession moved slowly down the carpeted steps towards the dais, and there took up its position. Advancing towards the Queen, who sat with her back to the orchestra, and fronting the rest of the audience, the Prince of Wales then read with full voice and admirable emphasis the address to her Majesty, reporting the successful completion of the Hall. The reading was somewhat marred by an echo which seemed suddenly to wake from the organ or picture-gallery, and repeated the words with a mocking emphasis. The Queen handed to the Prince a written answer, and said in a clear voice, "I wish to express my great admiration of this beautiful Hall, and my earnest wishes for its complete success." After a prayer from the Bishop of London, the Prince exclaimed, "The Queen declares this Hall to be now opened," followed by a burst of cheering, the National Anthem, and the distant discharge of the park guns. The opening was celebrated by a concert, which included the performance of a cantata written expressly for the occasion by Sir Michael Costa. The orchestra numbered 900 singers, and nearly 200 players. The cost of the Hall was estimated at 200,000*l.*, and to the unbounded astonishment of all who ever employed architects or paid builders, this estimate was not exceeded.

The following description of the Hall appeared at the time :—

"The original designs have been departed from in some few details, but on the whole the building is in its main features what it was at first intended to be, and the alterations have all happily turned out improvements. The provisional committee have been entrusted with full power of management until the completion of the Hall; afterwards it will be managed under the Royal Charter granted in April, 1867. The foundation-stone was laid by the Queen on May 20th, in the same year.

"The general appearance of the Hall without is that of an immense circular building, in the modern Italian style, of red brick, with yellow dressings, an abundance of long, narrow clerestory-windows, a wide band of decorations above them, a high gallery running round the entire exterior, and an elegant glass dome crowning the whole. The most interesting feature of the exterior is no doubt the frieze—the band to which we have referred. It is formed of designs by Armstead, Armitage, Horsley, Marks, Pickersgill, Poynter, and Yeames, the subjects being allegorical, and fanciful representations of the great peoples of the globe, and the triumphs of human prowess and skill. Appropriate passages from Holy Writ are inscribed; also statements as to the origin, beginning, and finishing of the structure. The frieze is executed in tesserae of terra-cotta, by Minton, Hollins, and Co., through the female students of the schools of art; and while the mosaic is simple in outline and colour, it is strikingly effective. The aim was to imitate the best period of

Italian terra-cotta, and employ the material rather as brick than as an imitation of stone. This was, so far as England is concerned, an experiment, and its success makes it worthy of wider imitation. The appearance within is pleasing in the highest degree.

"The Hall is apportioned into—the arena, accommodating 1000 persons; the amphitheatre, accommodating 1400; two tiers of boxes, forty-three in one, eighty-six in the other, accommodating 1100; balcony, accommodating 2500; and gallery, accommodating 2000; so that, exclusive of singers and musicians (for whose use there are about 2000 orchestra seats), the Royal Albert Hall will seat 8000 persons. The main entrance is through a handsome portico opening on the Kensington Road. But there are other main entrances—one from the Horticultural Gardens—and at least two dozen doors of egress and ingress. So carefully have these arrangements been made, that ten thousand persons were at the late concert cleared out of the building in ten minutes. The boxes, which are mostly sold, are being fitted up according to the tastes of their individual owners, and the few that are completed have all the beauty and luxury of a drawing-room. The Queen has the largest box on the grand tier. The Prince of Wales's box is also on the grand tier, and the Duke of Edinburgh and the Duke of Cambridge are joint proprietors of the box adjoining on one side, while the Duke of Sutherland owns that on the other. It was thought at first that so many boxes would never be disposed of, many considering that 1000*l.* for a box for ten persons on the grand tier, and 500*l.* for a box for five on the second tier were too high prices, although the proprietorship was to extend over 999 years. Not only, however, were the boxes in demand, but thirty-two additional have been added. Although the fittings of the interiors are matters concerning the owners alone, all the outer curtains are to be crimson, than which nothing could better harmonize with the buff and French grey of the wood work and the brass fittings. The balcony is an open tier of single seats, and immediately behind it is the gallery. Thirty bays, with piers and caps of composite design, and seraglio columns, are an effective termination, lightened and softened by the glass dome. The seats of each division of the house terminate about fifty feet from the orchestra, and the end—if end there can be in an oval—is the organ. This faces the Kensington entrance, and is close to the entrance to the gardens. The intervening space is the widest distance in the Hall, namely, 200 feet, the shorter length being 180 feet, and the height from arena to dome 140 feet. The organ, of ninety stops and fourteen couplers, built by Mr. Willis, is intended and acknowledged to be the finest in the world. It has a fine front, in keeping with the architecture of the building.

Space would fail us to describe in detail the elaborate internal arrangements—the corridors in which, but for continual directions on the walls and doorposts, a wayfarer would be lost; the crush-rooms over the porticoes; the retiring-rooms for royalty and for the public; the staircases for the agile, and lifts for the indisposed and weary;

the refreshment and promenade rooms; the lecture-theatre and concert-room in the wing buildings for the furtherance of science and art; the steam-engines which blow the bellows of the monster organ, feed the water-pipes, and set in motion the ventilating fans that heat, cool, or exhaust the air in the shortest space of time; the revolving chairs in the amphitheatre, or the movable cushioned seats of the balcony, or the wonderful system of electricity by which Mr. Ludd will light the 4210 gas jets in ten seconds—a feat the like of which has never, we believe, been attempted before. These appliances, perfect of their kind, we can but enumerate. The gallery before mentioned is to be known as the Picture-Gallery, but for the present it will, in common with some of the larger rooms, be used for the purposes of the International Exhibition. The question which must arise in the mind of every visitor who gazes for the first time on the Royal Albert Hall is, ‘What will they do with it?’ The first answer, perhaps, should be an assurance that the concern will pay. Of this there is no doubt, even now. Afterwards, it may be replied that the Hall is available for congresses to promote the interests of science and art, for musical performances, for the meetings and conversaziones of learned bodies, for agricultural and horticultural, for national and international exhibitions. For these purposes the Hall is not only available, but adapted; and the arena we shall expect to find, before the season is over, the popular place of promenade, flower-shows, and military bands for the West-end.”

The first public use made of the Royal Albert Hall was on the 12th April, when the first of a series of six concerts by the Society of Arts, in aid of a national training school for music, was given. The beautiful interior of the Hall, illuminated by clusters of gas-jets, suspended from the roof and from the centre of the gallery arches, appeared to even greater advantage than by daylight. The shilling “orchestra seats” were completely filled, and the arena was numerously attended; the audience in other portions of the Hall presenting a less compact appearance. It soon became manifest that, notwithstanding all that had been done to counteract the excessive reverberation, more remained to be effected if the Hall was to fulfil the proper conditions of a concert-room. The echo was most observable in the orchestral pieces and accompaniments—the solos, vocal and instrumental, were more distinctly heard than at the opening performances.

APRIL.

1. UNIVERSITY BOAT-RACE.—The twenty-eighth occasion of this now annual eight-oared match scored another victory to the light blue. The attendance was said not to be up to the average of the last few years. The boats, which took up their positions a few minutes after ten, were manned as follows:—

CAMBRIDGE.			OXFORD		
	st.	lb.		st.	lb.
1. J. S. Follett, Third Trinity .	11	6½	1. S. H. Woodhouse, University	11	6½
2. J. B. Close, First Trinity .	11	8	2. E. Giles, Christchurch . .	11	13½
3. H. Lomax, First Trinity .	12	2	3. T. S. Baker, Queen's . . .	13	3½
4. E. A. Spencer, Second Trinity	12	9	4. E. C. Malan, Worcester . .	13	1
5. W. H. Lowe, Christ's . . .	12	10	5. J. E. Edwards-Moss, Balliol	12	8½
6. E. Phelps, Sidney	12	1	6. F. E. Payne, St. John's . .	12	9½
7. E. S. L. Randolph, Third Trinity	11	10	7. J. M. C. Newbury, Brasenose	11	8
J. H. D. Goldie, St. John's, Stroke	12	6	R. Lesley, Pembroke, Stroke .	11	10½
H. E. Gordon, First Trinity (cox.)	7	13	F. H. Hall, Corpus (cox.) .	7	10½

The current odds were 2 to 1 on Cambridge. Oxford won the toss and took the Middlesex station. The start took place at eight minutes past ten, and was beautifully level. For an instant Oxford seemed to have the best of it, the nose of their boat being a foot or two in advance, but it was only for an instant, as in the next half-dozen strokes the light blues had recovered their position, and, drawing away in turn inch by inch, soon showed with an appreciable lead, which they steadily improved as the race proceeded. At Barnes Railway Bridge they led by about two clear lengths. At this stage the race looked all over—hopelessly gone beyond chance of redemption. The Oxford crew seemed to be utterly beaten and demoralized by the long stern-chase, and to all appearance every thing was lost but honour; and yet between here and the finish the spectators were treated to one of the most magnificent displays of rowing ever witnessed on the Thames. Rousing his men for a final effort, Mr. Lesley quickened from thirty-nine to forty-three, and in less time than it takes to record it the whole aspect of the contest was changed. Hand over hand Oxford came up with the leaders; off the White Hart the gap was reduced to little more than a length; at the Brewery another half-length had been wiped off, and as the two boats breasted the Ship the long lead of Cambridge had diminished to some twelve or fifteen feet. From here to the flag-boat, which was moored a little distance below the site of Barker's Rails, the struggle was maintained on both sides with most unflinching determination, every yard of water being doggedly contested; but notwithstanding all the efforts of Oxford—who despite their distressed condition, held on with their spurt to the last, and actually overlapped the leaders within fifty yards of the finish—the light blues retained their lead to the goal, and ultimately passed the win-

ning-post, according to the judge's verdict, three-quarters of a length in advance. The time from start to finish was exactly 23 mins. $8\frac{1}{2}$ secs.

Oxford was clearly outpaced throughout, and their condition was not equal to that of their opponents. Their last grand effort was sustained by the sheer force of pluck, and the only wonder is that it was sustained for so long, as, with one or two exceptions—notably their stroke—the whole crew were hopelessly ragged and beaten by the time Chiswick was reached.

The result of the race was forwarded by the wires of the Indo-European Telegraph Company to India, *via* Teheran, at 10.40 a.m., Greenwich time, and reached Kurrachee at 10.43 a.m., and Bombay at 10.45 a.m. Greenwich time.

3. THE CENSUS was taken throughout the kingdom, apparently with the greatest ease, and without the smallest complaint. An old difficulty—the reluctance of the Irish emigrants to be counted—was this time completely overcome, through the energetic support given by Archbishop Manning to the Government. The old belief, that it was an impious act to number the people, seemed to have entirely disappeared, and the only point on which any apparent feeling remained was that of age, the reluctance to state the truth in that respect being in some quarters incurable.

— INDIGNATION MEETING.—A meeting so called was held at St. James's Hall, the object of which was "to protest against the unconstitutional policy of the House of Lords in rejecting Bills repeatedly passed by the representatives of the people in the House of Commons, and to demand the immediate removal of the bishops from the House of Lords." It was one of the most noisy and riotous meetings held in London for some time. Of the twelve or fifteen members of Parliament who had been announced as likely to take part not one was present, except the chairman, Mr. Thomas Chambers, who was supported by Mr. Whalley and Mr. McCarthy Downing, whose names had not been announced. Letters were, however, read from most of the absentees, and other members of Parliament, apologizing for their non-attendance.

The meeting was called by the persons interested in the Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Bill, but among the audience were a number of the "Advanced Liberals" of Greenwich and the Republicans who meet in Holborn and St. Luke's; and this section of the meeting became very turbulent when it was discovered that their assistance was only required to pass what they called "milk-and-water resolutions." The speakers were interrupted by shouts of "We want a Republic!" and at one stage of the proceedings a young man sitting in the lower gallery waved out in front of the whole audience a red flag. The outcry of the audience was startling for a moment, and then a gentleman dashed through the throng defending the flag, and, single-handed, tore it from its position. An attempt was made to hustle him, but he completely destroyed the flag, and broke its staff. Loud cheers arose from all parts of

the hall; and the Red Republicans, who clung to the railings in order to save themselves from ejection, did not, apparently, get off very lightly. To a resolution suggesting that some means should be adopted for limiting the power of veto possessed by the House of Lords, which was moved by Mr. Baxter Langley and supported by Mr. McCarthy Downing, Dr. Sandwith, and others, an amendment was moved by "a youth of ungainly figure," declaring that it was desirable "to abolish the House of Lords altogether." This speaker was about to read "what had been proposed in the National Assembly of France in 1789," but the meeting refused to hear it. The amendment was seconded by Mr. George Odger, and on being put to the meeting—once by the Chairman and once by Mr. Odger himself—the show of hands appeared to be about equal. The Chairman, however, declared the amendment lost, and a "scene of the wildest confusion" followed. A resolution, expressing indignation at the rejection by the House of Lords of the Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister Bill, was then moved by Mr. Slack and supported by Mr. Whalley, M.P., and carried. This was followed by another in favour of "relieving the bishops from their attendance in the House of Lords;" and to this an amendment which had been previously brought forward was pressed, to the effect that the meeting did not merely desire the removal of the bishops, but the establishment of a Chamber of Legislature responsible to the people. This was supported by a very large majority of the meeting, but the Chairman would not accept it as an amendment; whereupon Mr. Slack, protesting against what he termed the thoroughly illegal and disgraceful conduct of the Chairman, put the amendment, and it was declared to be carried. The meeting then broke up.

— VISIT OF HER MAJESTY TO THE EMPEROR NAPOLEON. — Her Majesty the Queen, accompanied by H.R.H. Prince Leopold, paid a visit to the Emperor Napoleon at Chiselmurst, going by special train from Windsor.

Camden House was reached in a few minutes, and upon their arrival the Queen and Prince Leopold were received with much cordiality by the Emperor and Empress. The visit lasted about half an hour.

6. MUSICAL SERVICE.—At Westminster Abbey, Bach's *Passion-music*—a work of art analogous in sublimity and grandeur to Handel's "*Messiah*"—was heard for the first time in this country according to its original and proper purpose—as a portion of a religious celebration of the most solemn occasion in the Christian year¹. The special service held in the nave included Bach's music, or rather selected portions thereof—an event of special interest, as recognizing among us the importance of music as a portion of religious worship. The instrumentalists and choristers were ranged in ascending rows on each side of the organ screen. The effect of the whole service, amid the solemn surroundings of the building,

¹ The Eve of Good Friday.

and in association with the awful occasion commemorated, will not soon be forgotten by those who attended it. Long before the commencement the nave was crowded to excess, and even other parts of the building, where hearing was difficult, were thronged by many who had been unable to gain nearer approach.

— BIRTH AND DEATH OF AN INFANT PRINCE.—The Princess of Wales was safely delivered of a boy, who lived only twenty-four hours. Previous to its death the child was christened Alexander John Charles Albert, and the funeral took place a few days afterwards in the churchyard of St. Mary Magdalen, Sandringham. It was of the simplest character, and conducted with the utmost privacy.

9. THE LONDON RED REPUBLICANS.—At a time when congregations were passing on their way to places of worship, the scarlet emblem of Red Republicanism, topped by an ugly-shaped cap of liberty, was mounted over the drinking fountain on Clerkenwell-green, in signification that the sympathizers with the Communists of Paris intended to hold a preliminary demonstration to the one at which they asked the attendance “in thousands” of working men to show sympathy with “French Brethren” now struggling to emancipate labour, and to found a real Republic.” There was a larger attendance on the “Green” than at Trafalgar-square, but the listeners were principally youths from Southwark, the lower classes of artisans from St. Luke’s and Bethnal-green, and Irish labourers.

The proceedings under the red flag were opened by one of the prominent Republican disturbers of the St. James’s Hall meeting of the 3rd. He energetically denounced the Versailles Government of France, and warmly urged that the sympathies of the English working men should be given to those who were fighting freedom’s battle in Paris, and he described the Parisian party as the true pioneers of liberty. A resolution was put and carried to the effect that, in the opinion of the meeting, it was desirable to hold the proposed “Republican demonstration” on a day indicated in a West-end park.

It was then announced to the crowd that a collection would be made towards defraying the expenses of the forthcoming demonstration. Thereupon the throng lessened, and half the audience went off to opposition orators who were sharing the green, and were eloquent on the evils of intemperance. While the box was going round, the Chairman read the “Marseillaise,” and this being ended, the red flag was dismounted, and the proceedings were considered concluded for the morning.

10. THE VOLUNTEERS AT BRIGHTON.—The annual field-day of the volunteers at Brighton on Easter Monday, the eighth which had taken place there, in every way proved the perfect success which had been contemplated and predicted, though some severe criticisms were passed upon details, and though fewer men were on the ground than on recent occasions, the number being 25,000. Fully one-half of these had taken up their quarters in the town previous to the review-day, the 37th Middlesex (Bloomsbury) and the 1st Middlesex Artillery marching down. Those of the volunteers who went

down on Monday morning were conveyed in twenty-two trains, all of which delivered their freights within two hours, leaving the way clear for 14,000 or 15,000 visitors, who arrived with a promptitude and regularity only due to long and careful preparation. As the volunteers reached the platform in the Montpelier-road they passed through the spacious goods' shed, and fell in within the railway precincts beyond the shed. Thence, forming as rapidly as possible, they marched in rapid succession into the town, taking up the positions assigned to them. The men had ample time for breakfast before ten o'clock, when the first move was made.

A field-gun on the Parade, just outside the Royal Albion Hotel, was fired by way of signal. A shower of broken glass from the hotel windows and lively emotion in the coffee-room were the immediate response. Such a success was hardly anticipated by the gunners, who seemed somewhat alarmed at the crash themselves had made, and perhaps were apprehensive of a glazier's bill. But in the presence of Mars small troubles like these are of no account. The artillery moved off towards the review-ground, and were gradually followed by the various corps in the order assigned to them. The route lay along a portion of the Marine Parade, which was thronged with spectators, and thence up Bedford-street. Each balcony and window had its tenants; and gay dresses, scarlet cloth, flags of all colours and all nations, made the way as bright and cheerful as ever the Marine Parade can have been since first it skirted the English Channel.

The great feature of the day was, of course, the march past the General Commanding-in-Chief, Sir Hope Grant, who was attended by a brilliant staff. It concluded about half-past one o'clock, after which the operations of the field-day commenced. An enemy was supposed to have captured Brighton, and to be in the act of setting out for the capital, when he is confronted by the hurried levies of volunteers sent to stop his way. For some time the battle was confined to the skirmishers, who pushed, almost too boldly, into the enemy's territory, walking fast and far away from their supports. By degrees, however, these were gradually pushed forward, marking the ploughed lands and cultivated patches with broad stripes of red and grey and black. The attack lasted fully an hour and a half, and was carried up nearly to High Barn before the defenders rallied in sufficient strength to push the invaders back again, and even then their second line, coming to the support of the first, continued the contest for a time. The attacking force also had the advantage of effective cavalry support, the heads of the Inniskilling Dragoons, whose helmets, swords, and accoutrements glittered in the sun, peeping out here and there from the gorse in the hollow, where they dismounted, and forming a striking and picturesque central point in the combat that was carried on over a wide surface of undulating downs. Their services came even more strongly into request when the attacking force was gradually drawn back upon the shelter of Brighton, which at first it had despised, and a stand was made at

every point calculated to afford a good defensive position. At two or three points the furze caught fire, and rose into lofty sheets of flame, burning fiercely for half an hour together before exhausting the available material.

The review was over at five o'clock.

11. A JEWISH FESTIVAL INTERRUPTED.—In the evening of this day a large force of police and detectives surrounded the Lamb and Flag public-house, Rose-court, Garrick-street, St. Martin's-lane. Several officers first entered the house, and in a room up stairs they found a number of betting men gambling. At a given signal upwards of sixty police entered the house, whilst others guarded every means of exit. About thirty men, some of them respectable shopkeepers, were at once taken into custody. The numerous arrests made caused an immense excitement in the whole neighbourhood, and for a long time Bow-street was so thronged that it was difficult to get near the station. The police also seized the long tables and benches in the room, and conveyed every one of them to the station. On the news spreading, great numbers of women thronged the station doors, begging for admittance. Several attempts at rescue were talked of, threatened, among the crowd, and at one time a general row seemed imminent. A strong guard of police was round the station doors and also in the station yard. Twenty-three of the men were brought up the next day before the magistrate, charged with gambling. For the defence it was alleged that the defendants, most of whom were Jews, had hired the room for a few days during the Passover festival, and that they were merely engaged in a little harmless recreation. Passover bread and rum and shrub were on the table when the police entered the room. The magistrate said that it appeared to him to be a very extraordinary way of celebrating a sacred event so solemn as that of the Passover, which surely might be commemorated in a far more becoming manner. But even if the custom prevailed, it was not to be accepted as an excuse for the violation of the law. He fined two of the defendants, David Levy and Moses Hart, 10*l.* each as the chief organizers of the meeting; nine others, who were actually engaged in play, he fined 5*l.*, and the others 10*s.* each. Most of the fines were paid.

16. A RED REPUBLICAN DEMONSTRATION IN HYDE PARK turned out a lamentable failure, the audience making sport of the proceedings from beginning to end.

The demonstration was supposed to commence in Finsbury-square at half-past two, and at that time a very small gathering with banners and a band which lent no additional charms to the procession, straggled in a sort of rough marching-order to Clerkenwell-green, where it was expected the Irish would join, but although many of that class were there, few followed. However, the number had by this time somewhat increased. Additional banners, too, appeared, one bearing the word "Poland," another "Vive la Commune," and a third "Universal and Social Republic." Two or three

banners had the American stars and stripes on a red ground, and were surmounted by ill-made caps of liberty. Some officers of the procession appeared decorated with bits of red riband, and for the most part, smoking dirty pipes. One or two with red sashes round their waists, in the style of '93, were entrusted with the duty of selling "Addresses," at the price of one penny each. The rank and file of the procession were constituted principally of boys and dirty youths, and they struggled through the streets by way of Fleet-street and Pall-Mall to Hyde-park, getting on their journey a whole-some washing in a downpour of rain.

Before the arrival at the park a great many people had gathered about the enclosure, no small number being foreigners. The natives and those "to the manner born" here were of three distinct classes—the roughs, domestic servants, and the trading classes; but the roughs only manifested a desire to obtain a close acquaintance with the Red Republicans, and they effected their purpose by climbing up the trees, which they broke in a shameful manner, and where they kept up continuous sport, while the other classes stood for a time afar off until the procession had come up; but soon after the speeches had set fairly in the exodus of the respectable classes was to be seen at all points, leaving the Republicans with a mere handful of listeners, and these principally of the lowest class. There were two "platforms," one on a costermonger's barrow and one on a park seat. At the first a person named James Murray, a shoemaker, presided; while Mr. Weston occupied the same position at the other place.

The principal feature was the reading of "An Address to the members of the Commune, the Central Committee, the National Guards, and the working classes of Paris, adopted by the people of London assembled in public meeting convened by the International Democratic Association, and held in Hyde-park on Sunday, April 16, 1871." It was addressed to "Brethren," and after tendering fraternal thanks to the Parisian Communists for their "sublime work," and bitter denunciations of the English Press, concluded with—"And although our unscrupulous and moribund 'Government' may seek, and no doubt are seeking, in collusion with the rebels at Versailles, to precipitate foreign intervention in order to annihilate your rights, we, the people of London, believing you to be fighting for the liberty of the world and the regeneration of mankind, hereby express our profound admiration for the grandeur of your enterprise, and tender you the honest, uncompromising hand of friendship and fellowship.

"Long live the Universal Republic, Democratic and Social."

The speeches, some of which were by foreigners, were all of one pattern at both platforms, and they wandered from speaking of the Paris Commune to talking of the faults of Royalty generally, and expressing a hearty desire for the establishment of a "Commune" in England.

One remarkable feature of the speeches was that nearly all de-

nounced the other English Republicans, and even Bradlaugh and other so-called leaders were spoken of in a manner showing no community of feeling between the sections of these people.

The "Address" was ruled to be carried at both platforms, and it was also agreed that it should be sent to the Commune. At the end of some speeches a Mr. Owen urged that the crowd should put subscriptions into boxes then sent round in support of the "organization," and he read something while this operation was going forward. Very indifferent success attended the passing of the boxes, some of which it was reported disappeared in the process of collection, and the advocate then went to the other platform with the same purpose in view, but the listeners in great part melted away at the suggestion. The band then drummed the people out of the park to the tune of the "Marseillaise." Very few returned in procession, and the banner-bearers, with a happy indifference to appearances, took the banners from the poles and walked eastward as much like the undemonstrative public as possible.

— COLONIAL POLITICS.—In Willis's Rooms, a number of gentlemen interested in the Colonies and personal friends of the Marquis of Normanby gave a dinner to that nobleman, on his appointment to the Governorship of the colony of Queensland.

20. ASSAULT UPON MURPHY.—Mr. Murphy, the anti-popery lecturer was set upon by the Roman Catholic miners at Whitehaven, and left in a very dangerous state. The previous week Mr. Murphy placarded the walls of Whitehaven with bills announcing that he would deliver a course of lectures in the Oddfellows' Hall upon the confessional and kindred subjects, and that he would preach a sermon on Sunday. The first lecture passed off without much disturbance. On Thursday evening, however, about 300 Roman Catholic miners employed at Clator Moor—marching ten abreast it was said—set out for the Oddfellows' Hall. Mr. Murphy had gone thither early to avoid molestation, and he was emerging from an ante-room to enter the lecture-hall when the miners arrived. Catching sight of him, a number of them rushed upon him, dragged him down the stairs, and struck and kicked him till he was insensible. In that condition he was rescued by the police, who pulled him within a door, and closed it upon the rioters. It was a considerable time before animation could be restored, and Mr. Murphy remained in a critical state all night. The next morning the lecturer lay upon a bed unable to move; his head was swathed in bandages, and his face bruised, cut, and swollen. There was a shocking wound across his left eye, and his body was dreadfully discoloured. The police had made some preparations for preserving the peace at the lecture, but the miners made their attack half-an-hour before the time announced for the proceedings to begin.

24. THE GOVERNMENT AND THE MATCH-MAKERS.—A demonstration of match-makers to petition Parliament against the imposition of the match-tax, introduced by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his Budget a few days before, was attended with riots in the East-end

of London and a riotous assemblage around the Houses of Parliament. Those who made the demonstration were principally working girls and working boys, a year or two in their teens, and beyond doubt of the working classes. They numbered several thousands, and were accompanied by men and women of their own class, without any admixture of the usual agitators. They assembled in the Bow-road at about mid-day, and they had with them huge placards with various "indignation" sentences, such as "What right has Government to ruin the match-makers to provide compensation for the army officers?" "Why should our industry be taxed?" "We work to live." The procession, headed by women and girls, moved down the Bow-road in a most orderly manner, and in perfect obedience to instructions given them to walk together and not to violate the law in any way, as a peaceable procession could not be prevented. In this, however, their instructions proved to be misleading, for at the Globe-bridge over the Canal, in the Bow-road, a line of policemen was drawn across the road, and not only the processionists, but all traffic was refused passage. The procession as such was thus broken up. While some of the petitioners made their way through the police ranks, others made their way out again into the Bow-road by other paths. At last, the procession was again formed, but on nearing the Mile-end-gate another obstructing line of police was formed, with mounted patrols. Again the people dispersed through highways and byways to assemble at Whitechapel Church, and thence, broken into three or four processions, they continued their march westward, some obtaining "lifts" on the way in waggons and carts.

One large body, formed almost entirely of boys and girls, came by way of St. Paul's Churchyard, Ludgate-hill, and Blackfriars, on to the Thames Embankment, where they anxiously inquired for the Houses of Parliament. Some of the boys carried broken boards which had originally placards on them, and these boards, the boys said, the police had broken up. One of the placards ran as follows:—"The proposed tax on matches. To the working men of London. Agitate, agitate, agitate, and insist on the withdrawal of this iniquitous tax on British industry. If it becomes law, it will throw thousands of poor families out of employment, paralyze trade, stop enterprise, and tax the poor for an article of daily consumption 300 per cent. Let us rise as one man and show the Chancellor of the Exchequer that we are not 'venal' and 'corrupt,' but earnest, provident, and honest."

The procession moved on to the Houses of Parliament, and had evidently stolen a march on the police, for it entered unopposed into the Westminster Bridge Road, and made the circuit of the Houses. This was about two o'clock, and while some strayed into New Palace Yard and into Westminster Hall itself, the main body stood about as if they had gained the whole object of their long march from east to west. Many were drifting towards the Thames Embankment, where the police, who had been quietly waiting in great numbers,

by their hard usage of the match-makers and spectators, converted what was before not an ill-behaved gathering into a resisting, howling mob. The banners and boards which had escaped destruction at the East-end were destroyed on the Embankment and thrown into the Thames. The people in return used stones freely, and, by all accounts, not without effect on the police.

In Westminster Hall, intermixed with the usual classes who curiously watch the members entering the House on occasions when public feeling is excited, were many of the match-makers, but a large force of police was suddenly marched into the hall, and commencing at the top swept nearly the whole body out.

The throng thus driven out of the hall into Palace Yard, and out of the yard into the thoroughfares beyond, swelled the now discordant crowds gathered there, in which were but few of the processionists; for many of them, bewildered and tired, had returned by the way they had come. The crowds watched every cab and carriage which was going towards the House, and it was easy to hear that they wanted to see Mr. Lowe. In this they were disappointed, for Mr. Lowe passed into the House unobserved, entering, it is said, by the underground passage. Mr. Bruce and Mr. Forster entered at the gates unnoticed, but Mr. Gladstone, who was escorted by a policeman, being recognized, was received with a hoot. Almost at the same moment Mr. Disraeli was driven through the gates in an open carriage, and received a cheer. The petition about which all this uproar was caused was privately presented.

25. **THE TWO THOUSAND GUINEAS.**—The first day of the Newmarket first Spring Meeting produced one of the largest attendances ever seen on Newmarket Heath. The following was the result of the great race:—

Mr. T. Dawson's Bothwell, by Stockwell, 8st. 10lb.	(J. Osborne)	1
Mr. Blaydon's Sterling, 8st. 10lb.		(Cannon) 2
Mr. Merry's King of the Forest, 8st. 10lb.	(J. Snowden)	3

26. **THE ELTHAM MURDER.**—Early on the morning of this day a terrible murder was discovered at Eltham in Kent. The victim was Maria Clousen, a domestic servant in the house of a Mr. Pook, of Greenwich, whose son, E. W. Pook, was subsequently tried for the crime and acquitted under remarkable circumstances. (*See Remarkable Trials.*)

29. **AN EVICTION SCENE.**—The papers of this date contained an account of a remarkable scene which had taken place the week before at Dunmamoay, a small town in the County of Cork.

It appeared that an old man named Shea was tenant of a holding in the town which consisted of a market-house. The landlord, Captain Shuldham, wished to evict him under a decree obtained at the Bandon Sessions. Shea was nearly eighty years of age, and both he and his family were exceedingly popular in the district. Two attempts were made to put the decree in force. Against the first so strong an opposition was threatened that the effort was abandoned, the second was relinquished on the ground that as Captain Shuld-

ham was high sheriff of the county he would not be justified in enforcing a warrant when he was himself the plaintiff. In order to meet the latter difficulty a special bailiff for executing the eviction was appointed, and as it was understood the latter functionary would be supported by a strong array of force, Shea and his friends resolutely prepared to resist the authorities in the most determined fashion.

The market-house was regularly fortified. The lower part of the building presented its usual aspect, but the upper portion was garrisoned by the family and their sympathizers. The weapons of defence consisted of pitchforks, piles of stones, and brickbats, and holes were bored in the ceilings for the purpose of efficient discharges of the missiles. A body of constabulary, ninety in number, advanced in three columns to the attack. A crowd tried to prevent their approach to the market-house, but the police forced their way through with fixed swords. The women of the mob made a strenuous resistance. A "redoubt" in front of the building was held by a group of women under the command of the Miss Sheas, the daughters of the tenant, and while the constabulary were trying to capture this position a pike was being thrust at them by a sentinel stationed at a window overhead.

After a brief consultation the authorities commenced to demolish the woodwork of the internal staircase leading to the loft, and as the heavy blows and sound of crashing timbers resound through the building, they elicit shouts from the people without; as the work of demolition progresses, the crowd waxes more and more excited; and the police have some difficulty in holding them back. The pikeman at the upper doorway, under whose very feet the assault is being made within, exhibits the utmost *sang froid*, calmly smokes his pipe, and nods assent to the exhortations of the crowd—"Pike 'em; pike 'em!" The blows on the staircase are redoubled, the fabric is falling with loud crashes, and the pikeman vanishes into the interior amid cries of "Bravo! John." There is very hot work inside now. The platform closing the head of the stairs is being smashed with a sledge-hammer, and pikes, iron bars, and a long knife are thrust down through the opes in the woodwork to repel the attack. One of these pike-thrusts slightly wounds one of the bailiffs in the neck, and then the orders are given in succession to the police within (now a strong armed party)—"Fix swords," and "Load!" The police return the thrusts of the garrison with their swords; and Constable Kilroy makes a dash at the pike which wounded the bailiff, and wrenches it from the grasp of the holder. The noise of the struggle is heard without, and there is intense excitement, but no attempt at active interference. The entire cordon of police now fix swords, and the utmost vigilance is needed to prevent the line being broken. Crash, crash fall the blows of the sledge-hammer within, and down comes the platform, covered with large stones, and half a man's person follows; he is seized and captured from below. The decree was in the end executed, and possession secured for Captain Shuldham.

MAY.

1. THE NEW INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION.—The Prince of Wales, acting for the Queen, opened the first yearly International Exhibition of Fine Arts and Industry, in the Royal Albert Hall of Arts and Sciences, and in the adjoining newly-erected galleries, along the east and west sides of the Horticultural Society's Gardens, at Kensington.

The weather was bright and fine. The gallery between the Albert Hall and the adjoining conservatory, and the conservatory itself, were filled with about three thousand people, some of them wearing official robes or military uniforms. Among these were the Lord Mayor of London and many provincial mayors. The Prince of Wales, with the Count and Countess of Flanders, Princess Mary of Teck, the Duke of Cambridge, Prince Edward of Saxe-Weimar, Prince Teck, Prince Christian, and Prince John of Glucksburg, arrived at noon, attended by lords and ladies in waiting and officers of the Court. They came from Buckingham Palace; they were received by the Commissioners for the Great Exhibition of 1851, who had the management of this annual Exhibition. The Home Secretary of State, Mr. Bruce, and several other Ministers were there. The proceedings began with the singing of a psalm. A number of official persons were presented to his Royal Highness. The Royal Commissioners offered him their report on the arrangements for the Exhibition. The Prince declared the Exhibition opened, twice making audible proclamation, first on the dais at the south side of the conservatory, secondly from the balcony overlooking the gardens. This announcement was received with cheers, a blast of trumpets, and a salute of cannon. A procession was then formed, which walked all through the galleries of the Exhibition. The last part of the entertainment was a grand concert of vocal and instrumental music in the Albert Hall, including special contributions from Italian, French, and German composers, as well as a new cantata for the occasion by Mr. Arthur Sullivan, all conducted by Sir Michael Costa.

— THE COMÉDIE FRANÇAISE.—The celebrated and historical company of this theatre, dating from the time of Molière, made their first appearance, as a troupe, out of Paris. The pieces played were the "*Tartuffe*" and "*Dépit Amoureux*" of Molière. In the first piece M. Bresant was *Tartuffe* and Mdlle. Favart *Elmire*. In the second M. Delaunay was *Eraste*, M. Got *Marasclille*, and M. Coquelin *Gros-Réné*.

10. THE TICHBORNE CASE.—This most celebrated of *causes célèbres* (reported elsewhere in this volume) was called on before the Court of Common Pleas. Judge, counsel, and witnesses were present, but when the panel was called, only three jurymen out of the

twenty-two summoned answered to their names, and the hearing was deferred until the next day, when nine gentlemen answered to their names. Two others having been procured, and the counsel on either side agreeing to proceed with a juryman short, the case was proceeded with. Referring to the non-appearance of the persons summoned on the jury, the Lord Chief Justice said that he should enforce a fine of 10% on those who had not attended on the first day, 20% for the second day, and, if necessary, would double the fine day by day until it reached 500%.

15. MR. MILL presided at a meeting of the Land Tenure Reform Association, at the Freemasons' Hall. Mr. Mill said that after the great changes which had been made in our political institutions it was impossible that the laws relating to landed property should not come up for revision. He recommended that appeals should be made to the more enlightened landlords, of whom there were many, to exert themselves to assist the association in getting rid of past anomalies.

Mr. Mill, after referring to the past history of the land laws, went on to say that the principle laid down by the Land Tenure Reform Association was that landed property was subject to the will of the State. By the land he understood the whole raw material of the globe, not having been made by man, but the gift of Nature to the whole human race, which had been appropriated by the permission, express or tacit, of society; and society retained the right to revoke its permission. Speaking for himself, Mr. Mill said he should hold that that might rightfully be done if it were expedient to do it, and he did not know what might be reserved for us in the future. At present, he did not think it was expedient. He had so poor an opinion of State management, or municipal management, that he was afraid many years would elapse before the revenue realized by the State would be sufficient to pay the compensation which would be justly claimed by the dispossessed proprietors. It would require a higher standard of public virtue than we had yet attained to administer the lands by the State. The administration of waste lands was as much as we were capable of. At any rate, we ought to begin with that. Mr. Mill recommended that part of these lands should be kept open for the lovers of natural beauty, and the remainder leased in allotments at moderate rents to the poor. In this way new life might be imparted to the unfortunate agricultural labourer. The great estates of public bodies, Mr. Mill said, ought to be taken in hand by the State, and thoroughly reformed; and thorough reform would generally mean that the land should either be managed for them by the State or taken away altogether, and such as were fit to be continued should receive endowments instead. He had been told that one-fifth of London belonged to these bodies. If these lands were taken, facilities might be afforded for improved dwellings for the working classes. With respect to property in the hands of private owners, the association did not propose to take from them any part of the

land already acquired. But there was a limit which went beyond that, which this association did not respect. Land was limited in quantity, while the demand for land in a prosperous country was always progressing. The price of land, therefore, rose, not by any effort of the landlords, but by the mere impulse of the population. The association saw no reason why this increased value should be permitted to the landowners. It seemed to be an unreasonable thing that, because their ancestors a few generations ago happened to hold land, men should still continue to hold what had become in this metropolis of the value of millions, to which they had contributed nothing. Let them at least see that no more gigantic fortunes were built up in a similar way. Let there be an increasing tax on land; and he saw no reason why they should not allow a landlord who desired it to free himself for life or for a term of years, by paying a fixed annual sum, by which the State would at once profit. It did not appear to him that was too much to ask in England, and less than that the working classes were not likely to accept.

19. ACCIDENT TO PRINCE ARTHUR.—A very extraordinary and painful accident occurred to his Royal Highness Prince Arthur, just before a State Ball at Buckingham Palace. The Prince was leaning against the window of the billiard-room which had been imperfectly fastened, when it gave way, and the Prince fell through it on to the pavement below. The distance was about eight feet, and the consequences of such a fall might have been most dangerous. The Prince fell in such a manner that, though the back of his head was badly bruised and slightly wounded, the force of the fall was distributed along the whole length of his body, and, though the shock was necessarily very great, no other specific injury except that to his head occurred, and in the effort to save himself, the great toe of one foot was dislocated.

24. THE DERBY.—The Derby of 1871 was one of the most successful of modern times. There were more people than ever on the Downs, and the spectacle they presented to the many *émigrés* present must have been striking in the extreme.

There were seventeen runners, a larger field than was expected, and the market underwent some important changes. Bothwell was not in favour, and retreated before the rush made to get on Albert Victor. At one time 9 to 4 was offered, but 2 to 1 was the closing price, while the anxiety of the public to back Mr. Cartwright's horse was the feature of the last half-hour before the race. The other excitement was caused by Pearl, and as little as 8 to 1 was taken about her, while the good looks of Favonius failed to improve his position, as he retreated to 10 to 1. There was little change in the others, except that Ravenshoe and the Count were sent to the outside division, and Grand Coup and King of the Forest were also out of favour. In the preliminary canter which was led by Bothwell and Columbus, followed by Ravenshoe, King of the Forest, Albert Victor, Ripponden, Pearl, Favonius, Noblesse, Grand Coup,

and the Count bringing up the rear, nothing could go better than the favourite, Albert Victor, Pearl, Grand Coup, and Favonius. There was about the usual half-hour's delay at the post, chiefly caused by the breakings away of Pearl, Noblesse, Grand Coup, and one or two others, and then the flag fell, the great shout of the multitude was heard, and to a beautiful start the seventeen came up the hill with the rose jacket of Pearl conspicuous in the race, Digby Grand and Noblesse in her wake. Going through the furzes Columbus fulfilled his mission by rushing to the front and making the running for Bothwell, but he did not long continue in front, and again Pearl's colours were seen in his place, to be soon headed by Digby Grand, who looked so well as he came down the hill as greatly to encourage his backers. The favourite was lying second, but he succumbed at the Road, where French on Favonius was seen to challenge Digby Grand and Albert Victor, and, King of the Forest drawing up, they ran a fine race home, Digby Grand being beaten opposite the Stand, Albert Victor and King of the Forest finishing a dead heat for second place behind Favonius, who won easily by a length and a half. Time, as taken by Benson's chronograph, 2 min. 50 secs.; according to a chronograph supplied by Messrs. Dent, of Cockspur Street, 2 min. 50½ secs.

The winner was the property of Baron Rothschild, whose success was greeted by sincere congratulations, destined to be indefinitely increased by victories in the Oaks and Leger, a "treble event" without precedent in turf-history. T. French, the celebrated jockey, rode the winner of the Derby for the second year in succession. The result of the race was telegraphed to Bombay, in eleven minutes. This same Derby day—Wednesday, May 24th—will be ever memorable as the date of the burning by the Communists of Paris, of the Tuileries and Hôtel de Ville.

26. THE OAKS STAKES were won by Baron Rothschild's Hannah, Mr. R. C. Naylor's Noblesse running second, Mr. Lee's Hopbine, third. The *Times* thus commented on the Baron's success:—

"Baron Rothschild has, therefore, with the produce of his favourite King Tom, second for the Derby in Andover's year, carried off the Oaks for the second time, and taken double honours too, by winning Derby and Oaks the same year—a performance, we believe, that has been effected only four times previously—by the Duke of Grafton, the Duke of Bedford, and Mr. Gully in old days, and in recent years by Mr. P'Anson, who, in 1857, carried off the double event with his famous mare Blink Bonny. Nothing could have been more gratifying to Baron Rothschild than the hearty cheers of the public and the congratulations of his private friends. One of the largest supporters of racing in this country, breeding his own horses and running them for the pure love of the sport, and a small speculator (on the Turf, at least), he has at length obtained the reward of every racing man's ambition, and for which he has waited so patiently and long. For two years in succession the Derby has been won by men who do not make betting the *summum bonum*

of their turf transactions. Lord Falmouth never bets, and Baron Rothschild has comparatively but trifling dealings with the book-makers. The specimens of this class of men are rare, and we are all glad when they reap a reward in which honour is the principal gain."

JUNE.

2. A LEAP FROM LONDON BRIDGE.—The following paragraph appeared in the papers of the 3rd:—"Yesterday afternoon as the 'Heron,' Woolwich steamer, had just emerged from under London Bridge from the upper side, a middle-aged gentleman, who was sitting on the rail smoking a cigar, suddenly fell overboard, and was seen struggling in the water, his head frequently being under. The steamer was stopped, and a life-buoy thrown over; but he evidently was too exhausted to reach it. At this moment a powerful-looking young man on London Bridge divested himself of his shoes, and, without taking off his 'wide-awake,' mounted the parapet, and dived to the great depth below, and, soon rising to the surface, swam to the rescue of the drowning man, whom he held by the collar of his coat until boats put off to their assistance. The daring rapidity of this voluntary act of heroism was greeted with immense cheering, and when they were conveyed to the Swan Hotel, at the foot of the bridge, an immense mob followed. The police then ascertained that the gentleman who fell overboard was a Mr. Peters, residing at the West-end, who was going to Woolwich on business, and the young man who so promptly dived was J. B. Johnson, of the Wellington Baths, Leeds, who had come up to town to contend in the champion swimming-match at Hendon, and happened to be passing over the bridge at the time. Fortunately, the tide was just on the turn from high water, or Johnson's head, diving from so great a height, must have come in contact with the ground. Every attention was paid to them by the landlord, and subsequently both were conveyed in cabs to their respective destinations."

The *Daily Telegraph* thus dwelt on the incident in a leading article:—"Hold up, Mr. Peters, one moment more! Johnson mounts to the balustrade—Johnson kicks off his shoes—Johnson *jumps*, and the women leave off screaming, and the men about the place break out into a roar of pure irrepressible human joy, and sympathy, and admiration, such as a grand deed must ever excite. The shout is caught up along the quays and from the decks and spars of the shipping, and all up and down the river wherever a sight can be caught of the gallant fellow going through the air like an angel in a shooting-coat and wide-awake, and plunging into the

Thames amid a perfect fountain of white water spouting up where he hits the river. . . . When the tremendous splash subsided there was an awful breath pause all round. He might stick in the mud, you see, at the bottom; he might be stunned by the terrific smack upon the water. He might—but no! by all that is good and gallant, there pops up his manly head—up he comes like a cork. One splutter, just to get his eyes clear of the thick Thames water, and one brief suck in of the necessary air, and then he makes through the tide at the sinking man, catching him just in time. Whereupon Peters is safe. Providence and Johnson have settled that. . . . Flannels and brandy and water, and a dry suit of clothes for the hero, which fifty people are eager to lend him, set the whole business right. . . . Could not Mr. Goschen make him something virtuously naval, or the Trinity Brethren something official; or might not the Archbishop of Canterbury constitute him a rural dean—if the wish be not wrong—as the nearest resemblance in ‘water-colours’ to the good Samaritan? . . . And he did it—‘he came, he saw, he leaped,’ for love of God and man. Here is the sort of Christianity which all of us, little and great, learned and unlearned, can read as we run—the forgetfulness of self for the sake of others and for the common good. Here is authentic manhood, skilled, strong, brave as a lion, and pitiful as a girl. To Mr. J. B. Johnson, then, we make our best respects, and we are proud to echo those cheers at London Bridge until they ring throughout the kingdom, and let every body within the four seas hear with pride and joy the brief but glorious tale of ‘Johnson’s jump.’”

A day or two later, unhappily, the following paragraph, which turned out to be absolutely correct, appeared in the *Leeds Express*:—

The Leap off London Bridge.—“We regret to learn that rumours are afloat which tend to diminish the act of heroism above recorded, and we regret still more that we are unable, after an interview with Mr. J. B. Johnson and his brother, Mr. Peter Johnson, to give these rumours unqualified denial. It is asserted that ‘Mr. Peters, of the West-end,’ whose life J. B. Johnson is said to have saved, is no other than ‘Mr. Peter Johnson, of the West-end, Leeds,’ proprietor of the Wellington Baths, and that his fall from the steamboat, and his brother’s leap from the bridge were pre-arranged acts.”

3. GENERAL SCHENCK, the newly-appointed American Minister, arrived at Liverpool in the “Cuba,” and was waited upon by a deputation from the American Chamber of Commerce of Liverpool, who presented him with an address.

General Schenck, in reply, said, “I accept and thank you for this kind welcome in the spirit in which I know it is intended. I understand full well that it is no compliment to me individually, but, what is far dearer to me, a friendly recognition of the Minister from that kindred nation which I have the honour to represent. It is appropriate and significant that this greeting should be extended to me through you. You are the merchants of Liverpool—

merchants particularly engaged and interested in all that affects trade between your country and mine. Your vocation, therefore, is peculiarly one of peace. As it is through the interruptions to commerce that collisions and war between nations often come, so it is through harmonious commercial relations that peace between Governments can often best be maintained or restored. You have been pleased to allude to my share in the negotiation which has just resulted in the agreement for the settlement of all serious differences between Great Britain and the United States. It is a work, gentlemen, in which I am proud to have been permitted to participate; and I do not think that you over-estimate the mutual blessings which are to come to both nations from that happy settlement. The treaty just concluded is one which, meeting in the spirit which I am sure animated the commissioners and plenipotentiaries on both sides, we could not fail to make. For myself I may say—and in this I am sure I speak for my distinguished colleagues, the British as well as American representatives—that it was our endeavour in all our discussions to deal with each other in all frankness, and to keep steadily in view three rules for our action, and for the government of our decisions:—First, to demand nothing which could not be conceded without loss of dignity or honour to the party making the concession. In the second place, not to cavil about forms of phraseology, but only to insist firmly upon that which involved principle, or was matter of substance. And, lastly, and always, to keep in mind that a war between these two great English-speaking nations, which could reasonably and honourably be avoided, would be a crime alike against humanity and civilization.

6. A CLERGYMAN BY ELECTION.—The Birmingham papers reported the “nomination of candidates” for the vacant incumbency of St. Leonard’s, Bilston, as a “scene of great confusion.” The Rev. C. Lee and the Rev. C. B. Ward were nominated, and the show of hands being in favour of the former, a poll was demanded.

A large number of women were among those present, and the Chairman, having begun his speech with “Gentlemen,” subsequently apologized for not having said “Ladies and gentlemen.” In doing so, he said, “I see several women present. I don’t know whether they are householders or not; I suppose they are widows waiting for husbands.” The Chairman proceeded:—“This election was not like an election of a member of Parliament; it was more important. It was an election of a man to have the supervision over their souls as well as their bodies, while members of Parliament only looked after their bodies. The extreme term for which a member of Parliament could be elected was seven years; but in this case the election would be permanent. How important then it was that they should look at the matter calmly, and not do any thing rashly. He hoped they would not act in a way that would make them a laughing-stock for their neighbours, but he trusted they would conduct themselves in a way so that they might have nothing unpleasant to reflect upon hereafter.” (Interruption: cries of “Chair, chair!”)

The Chairman concluded by reading the certificate of the burial of the late incumbent, which took place at Baker-street, Marylebone, on May 6th. Mr. J. Lambert, in supporting the nomination of the Rev. Charles Lee, said he took it that they wanted a full-grown man: they did not want any babyism. (Hear, hear, and groans.) They wanted no mediocrity. (Hear, hear, and groans.) They wanted a man of superior culture—a man who would be able to take the lead in all public matters. The stipend of St. Leonard's ought to command such a man; it ought to command the best brains in the country; 700*l.* a year was no fool of a thing. He maintained that they wanted a thoroughly Evangelical man. They wanted a man who could preach the Gospel of God in all its purity, divested of the superstitious mummeries of the Church of Rome. (Interruption: cries of "Go it again!" and "No insults!") The proceedings lasted three hours.

There was a dark foreshadowing on Tuesday night of what the election might bring. Large groups collected in the principal streets of the town, not always discussing quietly the merits of the rival candidates. Strong partisans of Mr. Lee had their "wide-awakes" bound with blue ribbon, and wore large blue rosettes on their breasts. Thus decorated they paraded the town, cheered on one hand and hooted on the other, till both sides grew wrathful, and once or twice the public peace was in danger.

The two days' poll terminated in favour of the Rev. C. Lee. The polling, which on each day lasted from ten in the forenoon to half-past eight at night, was throughout characterized by all the features of a severely-contested Parliamentary election. Colours distinguished the respective sides; cabs, extensively placarded, and every other kind of vehicle, were extemporized to bring up voters. These were landed at the different polling-places amidst derision from crowds numbering in some cases 2000, who began to throw missiles, and were chased by the police. In another direction men were pulled from vehicles, others were set upon in the streets, whilst a band of Amazons marched through the town, drubbing luckless wights who happened to wear opposition badges. The cabs of the other side were swilled as they passed with pails of hogs'-wash. Towards the close of the day an effigy of the losing candidate, the Rev. Mr. Ward, was burned. This provoked an opposition from his friends, and stones and bricks wounded the Leeites. Defiant bands then paraded the town, advocating the cause of the two clerical candidates, armed with sticks, while the troops of colliery girls and lads, chiefly Irish, who were partisans of Mr. Ward, moving in regimental order, broke windows. The town was greatly excited, but the police, under the chief constable of the county, were equal to the occasion.

7. A PENALTY OF FAME.—The remains of the Italian patriot, poet, and scholar, Ugo Foscolo, were exhumed at Chiswick Churchyard. The Italian Minister, and all the most distinguished Italians in London, together with many English gentlemen, assembled

round the grave. A canvas screen encircled the company; two flags, one the Italian and the other the English Union Jack, hung overhead. After the earth had been cleared away and the coffin wholly uncovered, ropes were placed beneath it, and thus, after forty-four years of interment, it was brought up again. The screws being removed the lid was lifted, but the remains were not yet seen, being enclosed by an inner shell. This was opened, and found to be filled up with sawdust, which having been brushed away disclosed the body of Ugo Foscolo. The form was intact, and the features still perfect. At the foot of the grave stood the doctor who had attended the great Italian in his last hours, and also the hair-dresser who used to shave him; and they at once simultaneously exclaimed, "That's the man!" The whiskers, peculiar in shape, which Ugo Foscolo wore in his lifetime, were still there. His skin, which was now of a pale grey colour, remained unshrunk, and effectually hid all traces of the skeleton, the pores and textures being also uninjured. With the view of making an historical painting, Signor Caldesi took a photograph of the body as it lay in its coffin, and of the surrounding assemblage, after which the Italian Minister delivered an eloquent oration. Signor Bargoni followed. The coffin was closed again, and, being bound round, was officially sealed by the Italian Minister, to await the arrival of a vessel from Italy—already on the way—to be removed to its last resting-place.

8. *THE ASCOT CUP DAY.*—Seven numbers were hoisted for the great race of the Ascot week, which resulted thus:—

Mr. T. Lombard's Mortemer, by Compeigne, 6 yrs.,

9st. 5lb. (Fordham) 1

M. H. Delamarre's Verdure, 3 yrs., 7st. 2lb. (Jeffery) 2

Mr. Johnstone's Bothwell, 3 yrs., 7st. 5lb. (W. Grey) 3

Agility, 4 yrs., 8st. 7lb.; Kingcraft, 4 yrs., 8st. 10lb.; Siderolite, 5 yrs., 9st. 3lb.; and Gertrude, 4 yrs., 8st. 7lb., also ran. King of the Forest, Hawthornden, and Ripponden were struck out. Betting—Even against Mortemer, 9 to 2 against Bothwell, 7 to 1 each against Siderolite and Agility, 8 to 1 against Verdure, and 20 to 1 against Kingcraft and Gertrude, coupled. The usual parade inside the royal enclosure was dispensed with on this occasion, and after two or three turns at walking pace on the course, they were despatched without preliminary canter to the post. Siderolite almost immediately took up the running, followed by Bothwell and Agility, and there was little or no change in this order till they made the final turn for home. Gertrude had been early disposed of, and finding the pace too hot dropped far into the rear, while the favourite lay about fourth to the turn into the straight, where Fordham brought him up on the outside, and Siderolite, giving way, came on, attended by Bothwell, to the distance, both horses looking well, until opposite the Stand Bothwell's bolt was shot, and the great French horse, amid loud cheering, came on hard held, the easiest of winners by two lengths; Verdure, who came with a rush inside the distance, being second.

13. ATLANTIC STEAMING.—The "Oceanic," new steamer belonging to the White Star Line, completed a remarkable run across the Atlantic. She left New York on the 3rd inst. at 3.30 p.m. By noon on the 4th she had traversed 245 miles, the weather being calm. On the following day, with the wind blowing strongly from N. to N.N.W., the vessel ran 320 knots. On the 6th, the wind being strong from N.W., the "Oceanic" logged 384 miles, one of the most extraordinary performances on record; and on the 7th, with a moderate breeze from N.N.W., she travelled 340 miles. On the 8th 334 miles were run; on the 9th, when there was a powerful wind from N.W., 364 miles; on the 10th, with moderate wind from W.N.W., 353 miles; and on the 11th, when there was a gentle breeze from N.N.W., she ran from lat. 51 11, long. 140, 211 miles, arriving at Roche's Point at ten minutes to six in the morning. At 9.30 a.m. the "Oceanic" left Queenstown, and arrived at the Bell Buoy at 3.20 on Tuesday morning, and after waiting for high water to cross the bar, proceeded to her anchorage in the Mersey, which she reached a few minutes after seven, thus making the entire passage from New York to Liverpool in a little over nine days. The "Oceanic" had 240 saloon passengers, the largest number ever carried across the Atlantic by one vessel, among them being Mr. Walter Montgomery, the tragedian, whose suicide was to cause such a sensation a few weeks later.

15. HARROW TERCENTENARY.—Harrow kept holyday in honour of the tercentenary of its foundation, by the yeoman-farmer of Preston, John Lyon. The High-street of the town was decorated with flags and festoons of flowers, and most of the masters and many of the residents too kept open house through the morning and afternoon. The solemnities of the day commenced with a celebration of the Holy Communion in the School Chapel at 8 a.m., which was followed at a quarter past eleven by the "Commemoration Service," at which the chapel was crowded to such excess that tickets were refused to ladies. The Head Master, Dr. M. Butler, preached on the occasion, taking for his text the first words of the 103rd Psalm, "Praise the Lord," &c. After alluding in terms of gratitude and thankfulness to the wisdom and benevolence of the founder whom they were met to commemorate, he passed to another subject of interest, namely, the growth of Harrow School. He said that he could find no trace of its being a great school till the middle of the last century.

As soon as the School "bill" had been called, at half-past one, the company, to the number of about 500, sat down to a cold luncheon in a tent erected in the School Yard, in front of the steps leading to the Upper School and the "Speech Room." The chair was filled by the Duke of Abercorn. Behind him, on raised benches, were the "House Choirs," consisting of 350 of the boys, who showed themselves admirably trained in music. Several toasts were given, and "Auld Lang Syne," sung as a general chorus, brought the entertainment to a close. During the speeches a violent thunderstorm

broke over Harrow. Dr. Butler was particularly happy in his reminiscences of Lord Palmerston and in the graceful manner in which he ascribed the present success of Harrow less to himself or even his predecessors in the Head Master's chair than to that unity of thought design, and action which had always been a characteristic of the school, and to the indefatigable zeal and co-operation of the assistant-masters, past and present. He also thanked the old Harrovians and the parents of the Harrow boys for the ready and liberal manner in which they had aided the endeavour of the former to make the Memorial Fund worthy of the founder.

During the afternoon most of the guests paid a visit to the Vaughan Library, where a book was laid upon the table for them to inscribe in it their names, for the benefit of posterity, as having been present and taken part in the Tercentenary Festival. Owing to the heavy rain, the games of cricket, which formed part of the promised programme, were omitted; but there was a rifle contest at the butts for a cup, which was given to the winner as a "Tercentenary Prize."

17. A MARRIAGE IN VERY "HIGH" LIFE was celebrated at St. Martin's-in-the-Fields. The American giant and giantess, Captain Martin Van Buren Bates, of Kentucky, and Miss Ann Hanen Swann, of Nova Scotia, on view at Willis's Rooms, St. James's, were solemnly united in holy wedlock at St. Martin's Church, Trafalgar-square, at eleven o'clock in the forenoon; the officiating clergyman was the Rev. W. Rupert Cochrane, M.A., of St. George's, Hanover-square. The bride and bridegroom were attended each by their friends, amongst whom were the twin negro girls, Christine and Millie, linked to each other by an accident of birth, like the Siamese twins. These girls hold their public levées at the same time and place with the giant and giantess.

The affair having got wind, there was, long before the momentous question was put by the priest, a goodly company of those spectators to whom any kind of wedding is always gratifying, and a monster wedding a joy for ever. Perhaps crowned heads or dwarfs would have commanded a larger concourse; but multitudinous, nevertheless, were the eyes which gazed anxiously towards the door for the bridegroom's coming. At a quarter to eleven exactly he arrived and walked composedly up to the altar. He did not wear the uniform of that corps of Anakim in which he is understood to hold a captain's commission, but an ordinary dress, if we exclude an exceedingly blue tie. At ten minutes to eleven loud whispers, succeeded by a dead silence, announced the approach of the bride, who, pale of face, and clad in a few acres of "white samite, mystic, wonderful," and with her veil thrown back—moved, as majestically as her peculiar circumstances or circumferences admitted of, up the nave, stood in front of her affianced husband, and looked down upon him from her superior eminence (for she exceeds him in yards) with the ghastly smile proper to the occasion. She had been preceded by the "two-headed nightingale combination," whose misfortune natu-

rally caused a buzz of comment and much hilarity. The service was read amid a reverential scene of whispering, giggling, and climbing over pews; and when it was over, the usual signing of names appeared to occupy much more than the legitimate time. As the reason could not be the length of the names, which by no means corresponded with that of the owners, one was driven to the conclusion that children of Anakim, like some other great folks, find writing a laborious and difficult operation. At last, however, the pair of Titans emerged from the vestry and strode arm-in-arm, followed by the sympathizing "combination," and accompanied by the strains of the Wedding March, to meet the plaudits of the outside crowd. At 11.15 all was over. It were rash to dip into the future; but one cannot help seeing that if, when giants marry giantesses the result is giants and giantesses, there was this day taken a step which will shortly "ruin the business."

— UNDERGROUND FIRE.—A most remarkable fire broke out in Sheffield underneath property of considerable value almost in the centre of the town. The scene of this singular occurrence was Trinity Works, Eyre-street, where for some time past an immense boiler, 30 feet in length, had been observed to be gradually sinking. The cause of the subsidence was discovered in a most singular manner. Mr. Holden, the engineer in charge of the machinery, raked his fires as usual in the evening, but on examining the boilers some time afterwards he found to his astonishment that the withdrawal of the burning fuel had not had the usual result. The boiler was full of steam. Mr. Mastin, builder, was sent for, and the result of an examination made by him and others was that a layer of shale in connexion with a seam of coal extending beneath the works, and passing immediately below the boiler, was found to be on fire. A number of men were at once set to work to remove the burning material, but it was found that the fire was not confined to that particular spot. There was every reason to believe that it extended a considerable way on each side, and to subdue it excavations of a very extensive character—not only below the boiler, but underneath or near the foundations of the manufactory—had to be commenced. The seam of coal and shale extended beyond the works, passing underneath an adjoining dwelling-house, occupied by Mr. Holden, the engineer, and to the cottages on the opposite side of Eyre-street, the inhabitants of which stated that they had observed a peculiar exhalation from their cellars. The origin of the fire was a mystery. It must have been raging for a long period, possibly for some years. A gang of men were employed in extinguishing it, night and day, for a considerable time.

19. THUNDERSTORMS.—London and many parts of the country were visited this and the following days by thunderstorms, and at times rain fell heavily. At Chester three houses were struck by lightning, and a man who was sitting by a fire had one whisker singed off and his ear blistered by the electric fluid, which passed down the chimney. At Leicester a woman was struck and com-

pletely paralyzed. On the testimony of a number of witnesses, "a ball of fire, surrounded by blue light," struck a house at Derby, and did some damage to the roof. A gentleman farmer, named Edward Perry, was killed at Kingswinford, in Staffordshire. He had been riding through some part of his property, when he alighted from his horse and took shelter under a hedge. Directly afterwards there came a vivid flash of lightning, and by this Mr. Perry was struck and killed. His horse, which stood near, was also killed. As a Mr. Daniel, of Kingsworthy, Hants, was being driven to Winchester, accompanied by his wife and some friends, the lightning struck the coachman and killed him. The footman, who was sitting by the side of the deceased, was temporarily paralyzed.

— **PIGEON SHOOTING.**—The Peers and Commons shot their annual pigeon-match at Hurlingham Park, there being eleven on each side, at ten birds, 5*l.*, entrance; the highest scorer to receive a silver cup. The lower branch of the Legislature, on whom odds were betted at starting, won by eleven birds, or, "a bird" a man, and the following score of the individual shooting tells its own tale:—Peers—Lord Suffield (winner of the cup), 9; Earl of Ilchester, 7; H.R.H. the Duke of Edinburgh, 6; Marquis of Huntley, 6; Earl Gosford, 6; Lord Leconfield, 5; Lord De L'Isle and Dudley, 6; Marquis of Anglesey, 6; Lord Aveland, 5; Lord Willoughby de Broke, 3; H.R.H. the Prince of Wales, 0; total 60. Commons—Mr. L. L. Dillwyn, 8; Mr. A. P. Vivian, 8; Mr. H. Hussey Vivian, 7; Colonel the Hon. Hugh Annesley, 7; Mr. Charles Hambro, 7; Marquis of Bowmont, 6; Hon. Dawson Damer, 6; Colonel the Hon. — Edwardes, 6; Viscount Royston, 6; Viscount Holmesdale, 5; Mr. Frank Milbank, 5; total, 71.

19, 21, 23. **THE TRIENNIAL HANDEL FESTIVAL.**—The great musical event of the year took place this week, in the recurrence of the celebration which has been associated with the Crystal Palace almost from its institution. This year's celebration was the fourth of these periodical events. In the arrangements for the festival the executants engaged numbered more than those employed on any of the previous occasions. The total number of performers was stated to be upwards of 4000, more than 400 of whom were instrumentalists—both these and the choristers having been partly professionals and partly amateurs, gathered together from London and the provinces, and the central point of their executive efficiency was the wondrous energy and skill of the conductor, Sir Michael Costa.

As at former festivals, Monday was devoted to "The Messiah." The orchestral effects were brought out with much force by the largely enhanced power of the band; while the more important choral portions of the score, realized by considerably more than 3000 well-trained voices and earnest hearts, produced an impression of overpowering sublimity and grandeur.

Wednesday's miscellaneous programme consisted of a copious selection, which occupied from two o'clock until half-past six. The concluding performance was "Israel in Egypt."

20. FOUR GENERATIONS.—A widow (said the *Times* of this date), named Susan Clay, aged 95, is now living at Ottery St. Mary, Devon. She has eight children living, the eldest being 68 and the youngest 48. Her grandchildren number 67, and her great grandchildren over 260. The eldest of the fourth generation is 26 years old. Mrs. Clay is in the enjoyment of excellent health, and speaks with pride of the extent to which her descendants are dispersed over the earth.

21. THE CENSUS.—The results of the Census taken on April 2 was given in a return presented to Parliament. The total population of the United Kingdom on that day was 31,465,480, divided as follows:—

England.—The population of England and Wales consisted of 22,704,108 persons, of whom 11,040,403 were of the male and 11,663,705 of the female sex. This number is exclusive of soldiers and sailors on foreign service and of merchant seamen abroad; and it shows an increase of 2,637,884 persons (1,264,144 males, and 1,373,740 females) since the Census of 1861. In the same period the number of inhabited houses had increased by 519,527, that of uninhabited houses by 75,484, and that of houses in progress by 10,502; making a total increase of 605,513. The uninhabited houses are those in which no person slept on the Sunday night preceding the enumeration; but in towns many of the houses so returned are occupied for business purposes during the daytime. The total increase of population is absolutely greater than any that has been previously recorded; but the increase was relatively greater in every decennium between 1801 and 1841 than it has been subsequently to the latter date.

Ireland.—The first report of the Census Commission for Ireland is based upon the summaries made out by the enumerators, who were taken from the metropolitan police and the constabulary. The commissioners did not apprehend that it would be necessary after revision to make any serious alterations in the figures, which had been carefully compiled. It will not create much surprise, considering the drain of emigration for so many years, that the population shows a decrease as compared with the last census. The present total is 5,402,759; in 1861 it was 5,798,967. The emigration returns from Irish ports show that 846,958 persons had left the country during the ten years, and it is estimated that if it were not for this circumstance the population would now be 6,297,265, assuming the excess of births over deaths to continue in the same proportion of .32 per cent. There has been a decline in the population of Dublin to the extent of nearly 10,000. In Belfast, on the other hand, the increase has been 43.41 per cent. The religious denominations are thus apportioned:—Roman Catholics, 4,141,933, showing a decrease of 303,332, or 8.06 per cent., as compared with the last census; Protestant Episcopalians, including persons who returned themselves as members of the "Church of Ireland," or "Irish Church," 833,295, being a decrease of 10,062, or 1.45 per

cent; Presbyterians, 503,161; Methodists, 41,815; Independents, 4,485; Baptists, 4343; the Society of Friends, 3,331; and other denominations, assumed to be Christian but not returned in distinct classes, 19,935. The latter consists of travellers, Moravians, temporary lodgers, and mendicants. The commissioners remark that only in the cases of twenty families have any complaints or objections been made to the returns.

Scotland.—The population of Scotland this year is 3,358,613, being an increase of 296,319 since 1861. The increase in the principal towns has been 183,114, or 20.90 per cent.; that of the smaller towns, 37,850, or 7.53 per cent., while the rural districts contribute to the addition only 18,821, or 1.32 per cent. The inhabitants of Edinburgh number 196,500, of whom 88,860 are males, and 107,640 females. The population of Glasgow is now 477,144, comprising 230,389 males and 246,755 females.

— *THE CHATHAM DOCKS.*—The formal opening of the first of the new basins and docks at Chatham, on which upwards of one million sterling had been expended up to this time, took place in the presence of the Right Hon. E. J. Goschen, M.P., First Lord of the Admiralty, Admiral Sir Sydney C. Dacres, K.C.B., and other officials.

The new basin, which covers a water area of about twenty-two acres, was intended for the reception of vessels undergoing repair, there being four large docks attached to it, two of which were opened at the same time as the basin. Shortly after two o'clock the iron-clad double-screw armour-plated ship "Invincible," 14,3774 tons, 800-horse power, which had steamed into the harbour, was brought alongside the entrance to the basin, in which she was afterwards placed, to be docked in one of the new docks, which took the name of the "Invincible Dock," from the first vessel placed in it for the purpose of being overhauled and repaired. The opening of the new basin and docks was not marked by any outward ceremony.

— *OPENING OF ST. THOMAS'S HOSPITAL.*—The new St. Thomas's Hospital, on the Albert Embankment, facing the Houses of Parliament, was formally opened by her Majesty, who had come up from Windsor for the ceremony, and driven direct from Paddington to Lambeth.

The central hall, around which are placed the busts of celebrated surgeons and physicians who have given their services to the hospital, was carpeted with scarlet cloth. At the end was a dais with chairs of state, and a canopy of scarlet cloth, on which the Royal monogram and crown were worked in gold. Among the company assembled were the Archbishop of Canterbury, in his robes; the Archbishop of York; the Prime Minister, with Mrs. Gladstone; Mr. Disraeli, with Lady Beaconsfield; Mr. Cardwell, Mr. Forster, and Mr. Ayrton; the Earl of Shaftesbury and other peers; the Lord Mayor and Sheriffs of London, in their robes; the Presidents of the College of Physicians and College of Surgeons, and those of the other great London hospitals.

When the National Anthem had been sung, the treasurer, on

behalf of the president and governors, presented an address to her Majesty, in which they recalled the circumstances under which the new building had been constructed, referred with "pride and gratitude" to the interest which the late Prince Consort took in the institution, and concluded with a reference to the recent marriage of Princess Louise, an event to which they referred as certain to "strengthen the ties which bind your Majesty to the hearts of your loyal subjects." To this address, which was not read, her Majesty returned the following gracious answer, receiving it from Mr. Bruce to hand to Mr. Hicks, the treasurer of the hospital :—

"I thank you for your loyal address. I congratulate you on the completion of a work of so much importance to the suffering poor of the metropolis. The necessity for abandoning the ancient site of your hospital has been wisely turned to account by the erection of more spacious and commodious buildings in this central situation, and I rejoice that a position of appropriate beauty and dignity has been found for them on the noble roadway which now follows the course of this part of the Thames, of which they will henceforth be among the most conspicuous ornaments. It gives me pleasure to recognize in the plan of your buildings, so carefully adapted to check the growth of disease, ample and satisfactory evidence of your resolution to take advantage of the best suggestions of science for the alleviation of suffering, and the complete and speedy cure of the sick and disabled. These great purposes are not least effectually promoted by an adequate supply of careful and well-trained nurses, and I do not forget that in this respect your hospital is especially fortunate through the connexion with it of the staff trained under the direction of the lady whose name will always remain associated with the care of the wounded and the sick. I thank you for the kind expressions you have used in regard to the marriage of my dear daughter."

Thereupon Mr. Hicks was required by the Lord Chamberlain to kneel, when the Queen, giving him the accolade with a sword placed in her hand for the purpose, dubbed him Knight, and he rose up Sir Francis.

Her Majesty afterwards made a partial inspection of the building.

24. FUNERAL OF MR. G. GROTE.—Shortly after noon the mortal remains of the late Mr. George Grote were deposited with all due honour in Westminster Abbey. The site chosen for the grave is at the entrance to "Poet's Corner" from the south aisle of the chancel, near the monuments of Camden, David Garrick, and Isaac Casaubon. The body was removed from his residence in Saville-row, in a hearse drawn by four horses, behind which followed four mourning coaches. The pall was borne by Lords Granville, Overstone, Romilly, Stanhope, and Belper, the Master of Balliol College (Dr. Jowett), Mr. John Stuart Mill, and Mr. Lowe, M.P.

The coffin, which was quite plain and of polished elm, bore upon it a brass plate with the simple inscription, "George Grote, born 17th November, 1794; died 18th June, 1871."

— **DEATH AT CRICKET.**—A sad and fatal accident occurred to one of the boys in the sixth form at Harrow School, while on the cricket ground. The eldest son of Mr. G. E. Cottrell, an old Harrovian, was playing in a game, and for the time “standing umpire.” Suddenly a ball was hit hard to “square leg,” and struck him on the side of the head below the ear. Death followed almost immediately.

— **THE COBDEN CLUB.**—At the annual dinner of this club, Earl Granville, as president, in proposing “Prosperity to the Club,” defined Mr. Cobden’s principles as consisting in devotion to perfect liberty in things political, in things religious, and in things material. I believe (he said) almost every question which he raised, whether of over-taxation for purposes not required, of removing legal restrictions upon the sale of land, or of maintaining peaceful relations with other countries—all might be brought back to the feeling which he entertained for unrestricted liberty, without licence, in every thing. The noble Earl believed, he said, that there was hardly a man in England who did not deeply regret the beginning of the late war, and who did not wish that it might be prevented. The general feeling of Englishmen, however, was that the course of her Majesty’s Government ought to be that of a strict and honourable neutrality. “I am not aware—being a member of that Government, and belonging to the Foreign Office, it is possibly presumptuous in me to say so—but even after the events, coming in very rapid succession as they did, with many surprises—I am not aware of Her Majesty’s Government having departed in one single iota from the strictness and from the honour of the neutrality which they believed the nation desired them to maintain. And yet at times, as we read the account of those marvellous events, and as we heard all sorts of stories of military prowess and of military calamities, there grew up a certain uneasy, indefinite feeling that we ought to be doing something, though we did not exactly know what that particular thing was. Dignitaries of the Church wrote little tales for school children, sold not by tens or hundreds, but by tens of thousands, and which, however amusing they might be, appeared to me to contain only one moral, and that was that it was disgraceful and humiliating for this country to conduct itself industriously and peacefully while any other two nations were fighting, and while one, as always must happen, was not so successful as the other. I am bound to say that in some of the speeches and writings there seemed to be a feeling that war was in itself such a desirable thing that there was almost a want of ingenuity and skill in her Majesty’s Government in not managing to involve us in a war which I believe in my conscience would have been of no use to either one party or the other, but which would infallibly have involved the whole of Europe in that dreadful calamity, and would have prolonged and increased the miseries and sacrifices of the two great friendly nations which were concerned. I rejoice to think that I believe all those feelings have passed away; but at the time I did sometimes feel

regret that some man of the independent position and weight of Richard Cobden was not alive to put before the country in the manner which he knew so well how to do the common sense and the reasons of the matter.

27. CRICKET.—The annual struggle between the rival Universities, Oxford and Cambridge, was brought to a close at Lord's Ground, and resulted in favour of the "dark blues" with eight wickets to fall. Mr. Butler bowled magnificently for the winners throughout, obtaining no less than fifteen wickets. This victory left Oxford still one behind her rival, she having won seventeen matches, whilst Cambridge had placed eighteen wins to her credit.

29. THE EMPEROR OF BRAZIL.—Their Majesties the Emperor and Empress of Brazil (Don Pedro II., and Theresa, daughter of Francis I., King of the Two Sicilies) arrived at Dover from Calais in the French mail steamer "Napoleon." The Princess de Joinville accompanied their Majesties. On the arrival of the steamer at the Admiralty Pier, their Majesties were received by the Count and Countess d'Aquila, who were attended by General Marcelli, Mdle. de Lisboa, the Duke de Nemours, and the Duke d'Alençon. In deference to the wishes of the Emperor and Empress, any official reception on the part of the local military or municipal authorities was dispensed with; but Mr. S. M. Latham, Vice-Consul in Dover for the Brazils, and other gentlemen were on the pier, where there were a large number of spectators.

Their Imperial Majesties took up their residence during their sojourn in London at Claridge's Hotel, and passed the time in an active inspection of the principal objects of interest, commencing daily at six o'clock in the morning. Westminster Palace and the Houses of Parliament, Windsor Castle (to which they were conveyed from the station in a hired fly, in the absence of any royal carriages), the London Hospital, Oxford, and the manufacturing cities of the north, in turns occupied their attention. They left England in August, to be generally remembered by all who met them for the enlightenment and liberality of their views, and the kindly courtesy of their manners.

30. REVIEW AT BUSHEY PARK.—Her Majesty held a grand review of her troops, represented by the Household Cavalry and six battalions of the Guards, besides two batteries of Horse Artillery and the 10th Hussars, amounting altogether to a force of some 4500 Infantry, 1200 horse, and 12 guns; facing the paddocks—infantry in line, artillery and cavalry in rear. Major-General Prince Edward of Saxe-Weimar commanded as of right; the Royal Artillery were under Colonel Tupper, Colonel Dudley de Ros commanded the Household Cavalry Brigade, and the Guards might be considered as forming three small brigades of two battalions, each under its lieutenant-colonel. Just as the Queen reached the saluting point, the Prince Imperial of France was discerned riding quietly in the rear of the line of carriages, with a couple of gentlemen. With some difficulty he was persuaded to avail himself of the opportunity of riding into the

enclosure where the royal carriages were stationed, and somehow or another the crowd found out who he was, and the heartiest cheers of the day were given again and again. The march past was, if somewhat difficult, owing to the nature of the ground, very satisfactory. The cavalry and infantry marched past twice, and then proceeded to represent a combat, in which it was supposed that an enemy, represented by a line of spectators, in a line with the Queen, had obtained a temporary success, which had forced the division to retire by bridges over the small stream, and to concentrate in the rear of what is called the Warren Plantation. The Cavalry covered the retreat of the infantry, formed in line facing the Queen, the 10th Hussars masking a battery in the rear. When the enemy had developed their attack, the Household Cavalry retired by wings across the water by the bridges and fords, and when they had cleared the front of the 10th Hussars in this movement the artillery, unmasked by the latter regiment, fired a few rounds to restrain the enemy, limbered up, crossed the fords covered by the 10th, unlimbered again, fired a few rounds more, and then fell back in rear of the infantry, which by this time had formed in line of battle, the Grenadiers deploying their two battalions, of which the first was extended as skirmishers. The Coldstreams extended the first of their battalions, with their right touching the Grenadier skirmishers, the second battalion in support, the Scots Fusiliers being a third line in mass of regiment. The line of skirmishers at once opened fire, the Scots Fusiliers and 2nd battalion of Coldstreams re-crossed the bridge, the 3rd battalion of Grenadiers re-formed line, and then in one grand extended front a heavy fire was opened in volleys by companies on the line of spectators, the skirmishers being recalled and a serious front attack being directed upon the enemy, supported by the artillery on the flanks. The wind was so far favourable as to unmask the whole of the line by blowing off the smoke, and the effect of the splendid line bursting into incessant volleys of musketry for a continuous ten minutes was admirable. Then came the "cease firing," and, the enemy being supposed to have fallen back on the right flank, where the firing was heaviest, was attacked by the cavalry in three grand charges of regiment after regiment, the interest in which was sharpened by the apparition of a timid and helpless squadron of roedeer, which after many evolutions, in which, to their honour be it said, the cuirassiers did their best to avoid them, furnished one victim to the list of the killed, and agitated the royal party and all the spectators who witnessed its fate. After this charge there was little left to do, but horse and foot pursued their victory according to the rules, and at half-past seven o'clock a grand advance in review order terminated the proceedings of the day, after which the Queen left, after one of the most brilliant and successful days which even her Majesty has had to note in the displays of her household troops, fortunate in all its circumstances, save, perhaps, in the ground and some accidents caused in consequence.

JULY.

4. A SERIES OF SEVERE STORMS marked the commencement of this month. A heavy thunder-storm visited King's Lynn. The lightning struck the south-west turret of the south-west tower of the fine old Church of St. Margaret's, by which the turret was shattered from its base into fragments. Some of these were hurled in all directions, and were picked up at a distance of 100 yards, while a large mass of masonry fell to the ground beneath, breaking the tombstones and trees. In another ward of the town, remote from the church, the centre house of a row of buildings in Exton's Road, was also struck by the lightning, by which the chimneys were smashed, and the electric fluid, after passing through the top window of a back room, ran along an iron gutter, the spouting of which it entered, and exploded at its base, near the ground, knocking down one of the inmates in a room below. The storm was considered the heaviest that the neighbourhood had ever been visited with. On the 5th, a heavy thunderstorm passed over Cromer, Norfolk; the parish church was struck by lightning. The south-west pinnacle of the tower was cut in two. The clock was also struck and injured, but the rest of the church escaped unhurt.

5. VISIT OF THE IMPERIAL PRINCE AND PRINCESS OF GERMANY.—The Prince and Princess Imperial of Germany landed at Gravesend. The guns of Tilbury Fort and those on board the Russian corvette fired salutes in their honour, and on landing they were loudly cheered by the large multitude assembled to greet them. They drove to the residence of the Prussian Ambassador, Count Bernstorff, in Carlton House Terrace, and were enthusiastically greeted by a large concourse of people.

8. A FAREWELL BANQUET was given at the Crystal Palace, to the actors of the Comédie Française. Lord Dufferin took the chair as President, the vice-presidents being Lords Granville, Stanhope, Powerscourt, Lytton, Houghton, and Mr. Disraeli, Mr. Tennyson, and Mr. Macready. The tropical portion of the Palace was judiciously selected as the best place in which to give the *déjeûner*, a crimson curtain, relieved by white hangings, isolating it so effectually from the rest of the building that the speeches were heard without difficulty at the farthest tables. The French of Lord Granville bore comparison, for purity of accent, with that of M. Got himself, while the grace and humour of his speech were things to be remembered.

10. ROYAL REVIEW AT ALDERSHOT.—Unwonted preparations had been made this year in honour of the Prince Imperial of Germany. It had been intended that two hostile forces should take the field, but unfortunately the programme was spoiled by unusually heavy rain, which took complete possession of the field. The royal party

mustered in force, accompanied by his Imperial Highness, who was the principal object of attraction through the day, conspicuous among the English cocked-hats, in his helmet with black and white plumes and his Prussian cuirassier's white tunic, set off by the broad blue riband of the Order of the Garter. The Prince's frank, intelligent face, and bold, soldierlike bearing attracted general admiration. He seemed to take a most business-like interest in all that went on, carefully scrutinizing each regiment as it marched past, with the help of a programme he held in his hand. His Staff consisted of Count Seckendorff, Major von Roerdantz, Major von Mischke, Colonel du Plat (placed at his disposal during his stay in this country), and Captain H. Hozier (on special service for the Camp). The entire force was commanded in person by Sir Hope Grant.

10. CAMP AT WIMBLEDON.—The shooting season of 1871 opened this day. Lord Ducie, as Chairman and representative of the Council upon the spot, was assisted by Colonel Fletcher and Captain Page, and together they constituted the executive committee, who were charged with dealing with all questions as they rose. Lord Hinchinbroke, of the Coldstream Guards, commanded the regular troops in camp, and Colonel Colville, as Camp Commandant, was succeeded by Colonel Phillips, of the Grenadier Guards.

The shooting opened with admirable prospects. The sky was bright, there was wind sufficient to be agreeable to the spectators without inconvenience to the marksmen. Most of the ranges were well occupied, and by lunch time matters were working as smoothly and steadily as if the competition had already been proceeding for several days. Mr. Steward's meteorological observations taken, according to daily custom, at three o'clock, recorded the "rainfall during the past twenty-four hours" as *nil*. After that time, however, indications were not wanting that very different tidings might be looked for in the next record, and although rain did not actually fall till some hours later, the weather-wise in camp were gloomy, and trench-digging became the occupation of those with leisure on their hands.

The Volunteers engaged in what, during the working hours at least, is regarded as the more serious business of prize-shooting, had in all seven competitions open to them, of which three were decided in the course of the day. The winner of the Prince of Wales' Prize of 100*l*. was Private Harris, 2nd Oxford. The fine weather unhappily lasted only during the day of Monday; at night the clouds which had been gathering for some time, produced a steady downfall of rain, which lasted with hardly any intermission till mid-day. The night was miserable, for there was nothing to be done but to go to bed, and listen to the pattering of the rain on the canvas outside; and the following morning was, if possible, more cheerless still, as it exposed to view the sheets of water collected on every side.

On the 12th the Imperial Crown Prince of Germany arrived, and made a tour round the Camp.

On the 13th, the 500 yards shooting for the Queen's Prize commenced at gunfire, and lasted three days. The silver medals with 60% in money was won by Private Mayfield, 1st Notts.

On Saturday, the 13th, there was an exciting competition. The International Enfield match between the three nationalities of the British Empire, in which the Scotch proved triumphant, being 15 points ahead on the whole score.

An Englishman, Corporal Cooper, of the 30th West Yorkshire, was the winner of the Challenge Cup.

On Sunday, the 16th, Service was performed as usual in the circular *marquée*.

On Monday the Camp was enlivened by the visits of Prince Arthur and Prince Oscar of Sweden, who made notes of any thing that especially struck him, and carried away, as a memorable document, the bill of fare daily supplied at a fixed price in the first-class refreshment-room.

On Tuesday, the 18th, was the competition for the second stage of the Queen's Prize. The winner, Ensign Humphry, was an undergraduate of Cambridge, apparently not more than nineteen years of age. When the result of his final shot was signalled, he gave himself up, with the utmost good-humour, to be carried from the field by his admiring fellows.

The Public Schools Match was another great centre of attraction during the day. Eight Public Schools competed, as in 1870, but the shooting in this competition likewise had greatly improved. The Ashburton Shield fell to Harrow in the former year, with a score of 268. On the present occasion the representatives of Harrow made 292 points, but only obtained the second place. Winchester sprang up to the head of the list, and was warmly congratulated on all hands upon the gallant victory which it won.

Thursday, the 20th, the leading event of the Wimbledon fortnight, the International match for the Elcho Shield, took place and resulted in victory for the English, Mr. Wyatt, of Salop, carrying off the prize. The captains of the respective eights, Mr. Wells for England, the Duke of Abercorn for Ireland, and Captain H. Ross for Scotland, were present during the whole day marshalling and encouraging their national forces. The English Eight obtained a lead, though a small one, at the 800 yards range, increased this materially at 900 yards, and still further at the last, or 1000 yards range, till at the close they led the Irish by 24 and the Scotch by 54 points. At 800 yards the Irish had an advantage over the Scotch of 21 points; at the 900 yards range both nationalities scored exactly the same, and it was supposed that at the 1000 yards distance the Scotch would justify their old predilection for long-range shooting, and recover some, at any rate, of the lost ground. This expectation, however, was disappointed, for the Irish, who were, contrary to all previous experience, the last to finish their stipulated number of rounds, steadily poured in bull's-eyes and centres to the last, two of their number making the highest score attained in any of the teams.

On Saturday the twenty-second gathering was brought to a close in the usual manner by a ceremonial presentation of prizes, and a combined review upon a large scale of regular troops and volunteers. The proceedings, unfortunately, were marred by one of those heavy storm showers which have become familiar at Wimbledon; the rain, however, was of short duration, and both before and after the sun shone brightly.

The Princess Louise distributed the prizes, and Ensign Humphry, amid general and deserved cheering, received from her hands the gold medal and accompanying sum of 250*l.* which rewarded the Queen's prizeman for 1871.

Looking at the Review which followed merely as a spectacle, it was one of the most gratifying that has been held at Wimbledon, though unfortunately at the very outset, and just as the troops were getting into position, heavy rain descended with a severity which may be inferred from the fact that while a regiment marching raised clouds of dust so thick as to obscure the ranks from view immediately before it fell, twenty minutes later the staff officers were galloping about through pools or sheets of water.

The march past, which concluded the review, occupied about three-quarters of an hour. The Royal Horse Artillery led the column, and was warmly applauded by the spectators; as, indeed, it had been throughout the whole of the movements whenever it came into action. The Hussars and Lancers followed, and were received with acclamations almost as general. The Battery of Royal Artillery came next, and it was noticed that it retained the breech-loading Armstrong guns, while the Horse Artillery used the new muzzle-loading bronze cannon, some of which, it was believed, were fired on Saturday for the first time in mimic warfare. The mounted troop of the Royal Engineers went past with the Cavalry and Artillery Brigade, and then the roll of drums and the "Soldiers' Chorus," from *Faust*, played by the hands of the infantry regiments combined, prepared the spectators for the approach of the red-coated Division. In point of drill and bearing there was nothing left to be desired on the part of these regiments, marching as they did, over ground of the most trying character. There was a difference in the equipment of the infantry regiments. Some had the ordinary belt and cartouche-box behind, others had one substituted of smaller dimensions in front. The regulars under arms numbered something short of 3500. The Volunteer leaders of brigades were the Marquis of Westminster, the Marquis of Donegal, Lord Ranelagh, and Colonel Fletcher. The total number of Volunteers present was estimated at from 7000 to 8000.

12. HER MAJESTY'S SHIP "DEVASTATION."—The formal launch, or rather the floating out of the dock of this great turret frigate, was accomplished at Portsmouth dockyard July 12. As the time drew near for the floating out of the ship from the dock in which she had been built, the rain fell rather heavily, but this seemed to have no effect in thinning the great crowd of people who had by this

time assembled round the dock to see the formal floating of the great turret ship. The "Devastation" was the first of her class afloat as a sea-going monitor carrying 35-ton guns and clothed with thicknesses of 14, 12, and 10-inch armour, and therefore looked upon to a very great extent as a triumph of the turret over the broadside principle of carrying guns of exceptionally large calibre at sea.

13. ASSASSINATION OF CONSTABLE TALBOT.—Shortly after midnight, as Head-Constable Talbot, well known in connexion with the Fenian trials, was walking along Upper Temple-street, Dublin, a man accosted him, and saying, "You —— rascal!" fired. The shot entered behind the left ear. Talbot fell against the railings of a house near him, but, recovering himself, immediately followed his assailant, and was about to grasp him by the coat when two or three men jumped out and threatened to shoot him. Two gentlemen and two policemen had also followed, and one of the latter was about to capture the ruffian, when he fired and wounded him in the groin. The other policeman caught him round the waist. The man fired again, but the shot passed over the policeman's shoulder and injured no one. He was then secured and brought to Sackville-place police station. Talbot was taken to Richmond Hospital, where he died of his wounds on the 16th. He had obtained important information calculated to thwart the plans of the Fenians, and had detected a plot for delivering up the forts and arms to the so-called patriots.

14 and 15. CRICKET MATCH BETWEEN ETON AND HARROW.—The annual match took place on Lord's Ground. Harrow was not thought to have much chance to begin with; and in spite of some good individual play, its eleven was overmatched in bowling. Eton won with great ease.

19. SIGNOR MARIO'S FAREWELL.—This week is marked in musical history as having witnessed the final appearance of Signor Mario on the stage. The opera selected for his last performance was "La Favorita," in which his representation of Fernando had long been considered as one of his most effective displays of histrionic and declamatory power. It was in June, 1839, that Signor Mario first appeared in England—at Her Majesty's Theatre. Born to a title (Marquis of Candia), Signor Mario, an officer in a Sardinian regiment, was early esteemed in private circles as an amateur singer possessed of a tenor voice of remarkably beautiful quality. Circumstances having induced him to cultivate the art as a profession, he made his *debut* at the Paris Grand Opera in the season preceding his first appearance in this country. For some years it was chiefly by the quality of his voice that he attracted attention. In his style of singing, as in that of his acting, traces of his amateur antecedents were long perceptible. These, however, gave place to a rare perfection of vocal phrasing and expression, and a high excellence in declamation and stage action, such as have rarely, if ever, been combined by any other dramatic tenor. At first, in the characters of musical comedy—especially as Count Almaviva in "Il Barbiere"

—and later, in such parts as Fernando, as Raoul in “*Les Huguenots*,” Manrico in “*Il Trovatore*,” Faust in Gounod’s opera, and other heroic impersonations, Signor Mario developed the rare qualities alluded to. Unfortunately, his voice began to decline when his best powers as an actor became most conspicuous. To the last, however, the cultivated singer was apparent under all his vocal disadvantages.

Again on this occasion these characteristics were manifested. In the great scene where Fernando upbraids the King, and casts back upon the monarch the gifts and honours bestowed as the price of his disgrace, Signor Mario again roused the audience to a display of enthusiasm. The reception of the singer throughout was such as strongly evidenced the esteem in which he was held, and the universal regret that his failing powers of voice should have rendered his retirement unavoidable.

At the Italian Opera House a handsome testimonial was presented to Signor Mario, on his final retirement from the lyric stage. It consisted of an elegant octagon-shaped casket, richly ornamented with gold mounts at each corner, and having a medallion, on which was engraved a verse laudatory of the recipient.

24. *GOODWOOD RACES*.—It is probable that the professional turf prophets, to say nothing of the whole army of backers of horses, never had such a disastrous week as that which commenced on this date; and many, if not all, the followers of horse-racing, either as an amusement or a profession, will have cause to recollect the Goodwood meeting of 1871.

Foremost among the remarkable occurrences in the Duke of Richmond’s Park was the defeat of Favonius and Mortemer by Shannon in the great race of the meeting. There were only five runners—Mortemer, Dutch Skater, Favonius, Ripponden, and Shannon; and all attention was concentrated on the two favourites, both grand-looking specimens of thoroughbreds, both as fit as skill and labour could make them, and of such undeniable quality that a child would have selected them in a crowd. Favonius was perhaps the more perfectly-shaped horse of the two, Mortemer being rather too high on the leg, and with fighting action which detracted from his splendid going. It was his wonderful stride that distinguished him from other horses. He had been the favourite from the first, and before the flag fell was at evens, while 55 to 40 was offered against Favonius. Dutch Skater was started not apparently to make the running, which was left to the favourite, but to render any assistance in case of need while Favonius was alone. The pace was bad, and to that in a great measure must be ascribed the unexpected result. Mortemer led, followed by Favonius, with Dutch Skater third, and it was not until reaching the top of the hill that the Derby winner drew up, and they came into the straight together, Favonius with a slight lead. As they approached the rails Shannon headed the two, and from this point the race was a fine one, but Shannon maintained her advantage to the end, and won amid great

time assembled round the dock to see the formal floating of the great turret ship. The "Devastation" was the first of her class afloat as a sea-going monitor carrying 35-ton guns and clothed with thicknesses of 14, 12, and 10-inch armour, and therefore looked upon to a very great extent as a triumph of the turret over the broadside principle of carrying guns of exceptionally large calibre at sea.

13. ASSASSINATION OF CONSTABLE TALBOT.—Shortly after midnight, as Head-Constable Talbot, well known in connexion with the Fenian trials, was walking along Upper Temple-street, Dublin, a man accosted him, and saying, "You —— rascal!" fired. The shot entered behind the left ear. Talbot fell against the railings of a house near him, but, recovering himself, immediately followed his assailant, and was about to grasp him by the coat when two or three men jumped out and threatened to shoot him. Two gentlemen and two policemen had also followed, and one of the latter was about to capture the ruffian, when he fired and wounded him in the groin. The other policeman caught him round the waist. The man fired again, but the shot passed over the policeman's shoulder and injured no one. He was then secured and brought to Sackville-place police station. Talbot was taken to Richmond Hospital, where he died of his wounds on the 16th. He had obtained important information calculated to thwart the plans of the Fenians, and had detected a plot for delivering up the forts and arms to the so-called patriots.

14 and 15. CRICKET MATCH BETWEEN ETON AND HARROW.—The annual match took place on Lord's Ground. Harrow was not thought to have much chance to begin with; and in spite of some good individual play, its eleven was overmatched in bowling. Eton won with great ease.

19. SIGNOR MARIO'S FAREWELL.—This week is marked in musical history as having witnessed the final appearance of Signor Mario on the stage. The opera selected for his last performance was "La Favorita," in which his representation of Fernando had long been considered as one of his most effective displays of histrionic and declamatory power. It was in June, 1839, that Signor Mario first appeared in England—at Her Majesty's Theatre. Born to a title (Marquis of Candia), Signor Mario, an officer in a Sardinian regiment, was early esteemed in private circles as an amateur singer possessed of a tenor voice of remarkably beautiful quality. Circumstances having induced him to cultivate the art as a profession, he made his *debut* at the Paris Grand Opera in the season preceding his first appearance in this country. For some years it was chiefly by the quality of his voice that he attracted attention. In his style of singing, as in that of his acting, traces of his amateur antecedents were long perceptible. These, however, gave place to a rare perfection of vocal phrasing and expression, and a high excellence in declamation and stage action, such as have rarely, if ever, been combined by any other dramatic tenor. At first, in the characters of musical comedy—especially as Count Almaviva in "Il Barbiere"

—and later, in such parts as Fernando, as Raoul in “*Les Huguenots*,” Manrico in “*Il Trovatore*,” Faust in Gounod’s opera, and other heroic impersonations, Signor Mario developed the rare qualities alluded to. Unfortunately, his voice began to decline when his best powers as an actor became most conspicuous. To the last, however, the cultivated singer was apparent under all his vocal disadvantages.

Again on this occasion these characteristics were manifested. In the great scene where Fernando upbraids the King, and casts back upon the monarch the gifts and honours bestowed as the price of his disgrace, Signor Mario again roused the audience to a display of enthusiasm. The reception of the singer throughout was such as strongly evidenced the esteem in which he was held, and the universal regret that his failing powers of voice should have rendered his retirement unavoidable.

At the Italian Opera House a handsome testimonial was presented to Signor Mario, on his final retirement from the lyric stage. It consisted of an elegant octagon-shaped casket, richly ornamented with gold mounts at each corner, and having a medallion, on which was engraved a verse laudatory of the recipient.

24. GOODWOOD RACES.—It is probable that the professional turf prophets, to say nothing of the whole army of backers of horses, never had such a disastrous week as that which commenced on this date; and many, if not all, the followers of horse-racing, either as an amusement or a profession, will have cause to recollect the Goodwood meeting of 1871.

Foremost among the remarkable occurrences in the Duke of Richmond’s Park was the defeat of Favonius and Mortemer by Shannon in the great race of the meeting. There were only five runners—Mortemer, Dutch Skater, Favonius, Ripponden, and Shannon; and all attention was concentrated on the two favourites, both grand-looking specimens of thoroughbreds, both as fit as skill and labour could make them, and of such undeniable quality that a child would have selected them in a crowd. Favonius was perhaps the more perfectly-shaped horse of the two, Mortemer being rather too high on the leg, and with fighting action which detracted from his splendid going. It was his wonderful stride that distinguished him from other horses. He had been the favourite from the first, and before the flag fell was at evens, while 55 to 40 was offered against Favonius. Dutch Skater was started not apparently to make the running, which was left to the favourite, but to render any assistance in case of need while Favonius was alone. The pace was bad, and to that in a great measure must be ascribed the unexpected result. Mortemer led, followed by Favonius, with Dutch Skater third, and it was not until reaching the top of the hill that the Derby winner drew up, and they came into the straight together, Favonius with a slight lead. As they approached the rails Shannon headed the two, and from this point the race was a fine one, but Shannon maintained her advantage to the end, and won amid great

excitement and uproarious shouts from the bookmakers by half a length, with Mortemer a neck behind Favonius. Such an unlooked-for result fairly astounded every body; for Shannon, though a very fair mare, was certainly not in the same class with the Derby winner and Mortemer. The time of the race was 5 min. 27 sec., about as slow as it has ever been run at.

26. SCANDINAVIAN CHURCH.—Prince Oscar laid the foundation stone of a new Scandinavian church in Rotherhithe, near the Surrey Commercial Dock, where a large number of Swedish and Norwegian sailors and workmen are employed. The vessels in the docks and the streets in the neighbourhood were gaily decorated with flags, and the Prince was loudly cheered by the crowds who assembled in the streets. After the ceremony a luncheon was given by the directors of the Dock Company at the Ship Hotel, Greenwich. Prince Oscar, in replying to the toast of his health, said:—"It is now about a quarter of a century since, for the first time, I beheld your hospitable British shores. You know that in the early days of youth one feels deeply, and that the impressions made are lasting. I was then in the naval service, and I can truly say that from that visit there sprang up in my heart the first sympathetic feeling for Great Britain, and for you all. Since then I have been many times in England, and this first feeling has been strengthened and confirmed by the esteem which many among your own countrymen have taught me to feel for this country. And how could it be otherwise? I am myself a son of a free nation—a nation which never has bowed its head to foreign tyrants, which has always had the heart and had the will to tell the truth, and whose sons have followed its kings not only to victory, but to death. Hence I think I have a sort of right to speak to you in friendly, sympathetic language. And I am glad at this moment to be able to give expression to this experience, that in all the communications which I have had with them, in all the different ways in which I have been brought into contact with Englishmen, I have found that when a friendly hand was once stretched out by an English gentleman, that hand, given with a good heart, never was withdrawn."

30. FATAL BOAT ACCIDENT.—A very melancholy event occurred on the Thames at Mouldsford, near Wallingford, by which Mr. E. W. Field, of the firm of Messrs. Field, Roscoe, and Francis, solicitors, London, and their cashier, Mr. Henry Ellwood, were drowned. The deceased, with Mr. Heston, left Cleve about an hour prior to the accident, in Mr. Field's yacht the "Yankee," and shortly after they started the weather became extraordinarily boisterous for the upper Thames. All went well, however, till the boat had passed the ferry at Mouldsford, when a sudden gust of wind capsized it. Both Mr. Field and Mr. Ellwood were expert swimmers, but Mr. Heston was not. They therefore endeavoured to support him by their united efforts. However, Mr. Ellwood soon sank, and immediately after Mr. Field disappeared. While Mr. Heston was struggling in the water assistance came and he was saved. Mr. Field had charge of

the boat, and while handling the rudder himself, gave Mr. Ellwood instructions as to the management of the sail. The water is 14 ft. deep where the accident occurred, and the bodies were not recovered for some two or three hours after the upsetting of the boat.

— DEMONSTRATION MEETING.—A great meeting was held in Trafalgar-square, in spite of the prohibition of the police, and it proved to be one of the largest gatherings that have ever met in this chosen scene of demonstration. The assemblage crowded the column, fountains, and square, even to the steps of St. Martin's Church on the one side, and the entrance to the barracks on the other. Mr. Bradlaugh addressed the meeting, stating that he was there "simply because the Government had decided they had no right to come there." He alluded to the message which the Queen had sent down to Parliament in the preceding week, asking provision for her son Prince Arthur, and parodied the language of the message amid much laughter. He entered his protest against the demand in the name of the men of Lancashire, of Yorkshire, and of other counties, for, he said, though he did not represent any constituency in Parliament, he represented a vast mass of the people, in whose name he protested against any more grants being made to princely paupers. (Loud cheers.) He reviewed Mr. Gladstone's statement that the Crown lands had been given up on a bargain being made between the Crown and the country that such provisions should be made, and denied that there was any truth in it. In the first place, the speaker said the Crown lands belonged to the people; and, in the next place, the amount paid to the Georges would have paid for the Crown lands over and over again. With a warm comment upon the conduct of the Government in prohibiting the meeting he warned the House of Brunswick that if its members did not pay their own debts and keep clear of demanding grants an end would come of the English people's patience. He concluded amid loud cheers.

Mr. Odger then spoke, and described the royal message as making a disgraceful demand upon the public purse, and he pronounced all such grants as immoral and as tending to immorality in encouraging idleness and the evils which sprang from it.

Others spoke in the same strain, and the meeting ended with loud cheers being given for Mr. P. Taylor, M.P., Sir Charles Dilke, and Professor Fawcett, and votes of thanks to the speakers.

All the approaches to the Houses of Parliament were throughout the evening closely guarded by large bodies of police posted in the neighbourhood.

AUGUST.

1. ROYAL VISIT TO IRELAND.—PHOENIX PARK RIOTS.—The Prince of Wales, accompanied by Prince Arthur, Princess Louise, and the Marquis of Lorne, paid their long promised visit to Ireland, the first week of this month. They landed at Kingstown on Monday, the last day of July, and were received by Earl and Countess Spencer and other distinguished persons. The civic authorities of Dublin greeted them on their arrival at Westland Row Station with an address of welcome. During the ensuing week they visited the principal places of interest in the city and neighbourhood, and were received by the people with much enthusiasm. The Prince of Wales took the chair at the annual banquet of the Agricultural Society, which held its meeting this week in Dublin, on the Tuesday.

On Friday, August 4th, he was installed Patron of the Order of Freemasons in Ireland. The ceremonial was performed with full masonic honours, the Duke of Leinster occupying the chair as Grand Master of Ireland. The Prince's reply to the address of the Freemasons was received with much applause. There was afterwards a review of troops in the Phoenix Park. The royal party returned to England on the 7th.

Unhappily the peaceful rejoicings of the week were marred by a riot of a serious character, which took place on Sunday, the 7th, arising out of an attempt to hold a meeting in the Phoenix Park, to demand the release of the Fenian prisoners. The authorities having forbidden the assemblage in the park, the leaders of the movement, including Mr. Smyth, M.P., persisted in carrying it out; and the police, in executing their orders, were attacked by the mob. Reinforcements having arrived, an indiscriminate fight ensued throughout the park, and many persons on both sides received severe injuries, including several of the leaders. At last the police, with the aid of their mounted detachment, prevailed, and the mob, having been ejected from the park, proceeded along the quays, smashing many windows. Eventually the people were dispersed, and at a late hour the disturbances were quelled, although great excitement prevailed, and bodies of police patrolled the streets.

5. OPENING OF COOPER'S HILL COLLEGE.—This Institution, founded by the Secretary of State and Council of India, for training Civil Engineers for the Indian Service, was formally opened by the Duke of Argyll. It is intended to accommodate 150 students ultimately at the college, but at present there are only fifty in residence. The Duke of Argyll, after the invited guests had been shown over the building, delivered an address, in the course of which he dwelt upon the necessity there was for such an institution, to provide properly educated engineers for India, and said he wished it to be clearly understood that there was to be in the college nothing in the shape

of monopoly. It was open to all. The noble duke exhorted the students to take the fullest possible advantage of the education which the College afforded, and dwelt particularly on the importance of cultivating the good opinion of the people of India when they came to mix among them. Colonel Chesney afterwards explained the objects and functions of the College, and said the objects of the managers would be, not to make the students mere book-worms, but to give them a practical knowledge of those subjects which would be most beneficial and useful to them through life.

7. **BANK HOLIDAY.**—This day was the first holiday under the “Bank Holidays Act of 1871,” and was generally observed throughout the country. The Government offices in London remained open, but the warehouses and offices of public companies, the Royal Exchange, and Lloyd’s, were all closed, and many of the shops in the city. In Liverpool the day was observed almost as strictly as if it were Good Friday or Christmas Day. The Bill secures to bank clerks four holidays in the year—Easter Monday, Monday in Whitsun week, the first Monday in August, and the day after Christmas Day.

— **NEW LIGHTHOUSE.**—The foundation-stone of the new Longships Lighthouse, off the Land’s End, was laid on the 7th. The stone, which is of granite, from Dinan, in France, and weighs two tons, forms the first or lowest course of the tower, and is fitted into the rock. The new lighthouse, when completed, will form a striking contrast to the present old-fashioned and ugly structure. It is one of the new rock lighthouses which are being constructed by the Trinity House, and of which the Bishop’s Rock, the Smalls, and the Wolf Rock were the first examples. Most of these towers are so far out at sea as not to be clearly visible from the land, but the new Longships Lighthouse is only about a mile from the Land’s End.

9. **THE SCOTT CENTENARY.**—Although the 15th of August, 1871, was the 100th anniversary of Sir Walter Scott’s birth, it was settled, in consequence of the number of distinguished men collected in Edinburgh for the meeting of the British Association, that a general holiday should be given on the 9th in that city, and a banquet was also held in the Corn Exchange. The Earl of Dalkeith presided in the absence of the Duke of Buccleuch. The toast of the evening was proposed by Sir William Stirling Maxwell, who spoke at great length on the place of Scott in literature, his literary activity, and, above all, eulogized his personal character. Scott, in his busiest years (Sir William remarked), was one of the most prominent figures in social life in Scotland, and one of the favourite lions of London. In these busy years enough was done to fill the lives of ten not inconsiderable mortals. One of the Homeric heroes seemed to have reappeared upon the earth, clothed in superhuman strength and the wig and gown of a Scotch advocate. Speaking of Scott as a poet, Sir William said,—

“Other poets have soared higher into the empyrean of thought, or have dived deeper into the mystery of life; but none has ever

told his tale with greater breadth of light and shade, or hurried his reader along with a more genial vivacity; none has ever lit up the banquet-hall or the battle-field with more of Homeric fire, or adorned his action with a more exquisite transcript of the scenery of nature. In this sphere, Scott is certainly the greatest of peaceful and beneficent conquerors in the world of letters. Bannockburn and Flodden are his; Melrose and Dunvegan, and many a fair domain and ancient pile between. It is curious to turn to his friend Moore's playful allusions to these poetical conquests at the time 'Rokeby' was announced in 1814. Had Scott written nothing but his lyrics, he would still hold a distinguished place in letters. 'Rosabelle,' 'Lochinvar,' 'Jock o' Hazeldean,' 'Norah's Vow,' and the 'Pibroch of Donuil Dhu' will be sung and loved as long as tenderness and melody, pith and vigour, archness, gaiety, and delicate humour shall please the ear, inspire the fancy, and touch the heart. These and other songs of Scott have made the tour of the world with the songs of Burns, and haunt the memory of most men who love poetry and speak English. They are the very songs to be sung in a strange land by exiles not much given to weeping and hanging their harps on willows, and who yet very steadily think of Scotland, perhaps not knowing how greatly the Scotland to which their hearts turn is the intellectual creation of Scott."

Commemorations were also held at the principal towns in Scotland. On the 15th a national Scottish fête was held at the Crystal Palace at Sydenham to celebrate the centenary. The day was beautiful, and the attendance to witness the Highland games very large. In the morning a collection of pictures, autographs, &c., was exhibited. In the afternoon a competition of pipers was held, as well as dancing contests. Prizes were distributed to the successful competitors, and the dramatic version by Terry of Guy Mannering was performed in the Opera Theatre. On the same evening, at the Cannon-street Hotel, about two hundred ladies and gentlemen sat down to a banquet under the presidency of Mr. Hepworth Dixon.

10. FATAL FALL FROM A CLIFF. — As Mr. Ralph Montague Bernard, the senior surgeon of the Bristol Royal Infirmary, was walking with his wife along the cliffs at Gwberty, in the Bay of Cardigan, the edge gave way, and he fell on to the beach seventy feet below. He sustained a severe fracture of the skull, and died in a few minutes.

11. FATAL EXPLOSION OF GUN-COTTON AT STOWMARKET. — A terrible explosion, or series of explosions, took place at a large gun-cotton factory at Stowmarket. It was believed that the precautions taken at the manufactory ensured immunity from explosion. Experiments had been recently conducted by Government officials which, it was said, showed that gun-cotton cartridges, made and stowed away as they were, could not accidentally explode. The Messrs. Prentice, or rather the Limited Liability Company in whose behalf they manage the works, were executing a large order for Government, and had as much as fifteen tons of gun-cotton stored

up. The number of persons employed at the works was about 130, and most of these were upon the premises when the explosion occurred. A dense column of smoke rose several hundred yards into the air, and spread out gradually into a fan-like shape; then there came a deafening roar, the explosion being felt in every corner of the town. None of the Messrs. Prentice was at the works at the time, the manager, Mr. Eustace Prentice, being on the Continent. Soon after the first explosion, Mr. E. H. Prentice, one of the partners in some chemical works also conducted in the neighbourhood, and Mr. W. R. Prentice, second son of Mr. Manning Prentice, arrived, and collecting as many other persons as possible, they set to work to save such of the remaining buildings as were still standing, but which had taken fire. These sheds contained a number of boxes of cartridges, and, though some warning voices were raised, Mr. Edward Prentice replied that there was no danger, and continued to draw some of the boxes of cartridges towards him, while his nephew, Mr. W. R. Prentice, assisted in pushing them farther from the flames. The result was that one of the boxes caught fire, and a second explosion of great violence followed, which blew the two Messrs. Prentice to atoms, and completed the wreck of the premises. The number of killed and missing amounted to twenty-four, and of wounded seventy-two.

The inquest upon the twenty-two bodies, which were all that were found, lasted nearly a month, a close inquiry being instituted as to the manner in which the gun-cotton was dried and stored, with a view to preventing a recurrence of so terrible a disaster. On September 6th, the jury returned the following verdict:—

“That the explosion causing the deaths of persons on whom this inquest was held was produced by some person or persons unknown adding sulphuric acid to the gun-cotton subsequent to its passing the tests required by Government. At the same time we consider, from the evidence adduced, that there is no danger in the manufacture of gun-cotton in the wet process, but that the drying and storing of gun-cotton should not be allowed near a town. Also, we consider that gun-cotton works should be subject to constant Government inspection.”

14. NATIONAL ARTILLERY ASSOCIATION.—The competition by the Artillery Volunteers for the prizes offered by the National Artillery Association took place this week at Shoeburyness. The firing by the Royal Artillery at 1200 and 1600 yards, which took place on the 18th, resulted in the victory of the 12th Brigade. Each brigade fired five rounds. The brigades which contended fired in the following order:—7th, 13th Dépôt Brigade, 12th, 21st, 17th, and the School of Gunnery. The 13th, the Dépôt, and the School of Gunnery made one direct hit each, and the 12th and 17th made each two direct hits; but the former, having fired all its rounds in 30 sec. less time than the latter, was declared the winner of the prize given by the National Artillery Association. Every brigade fired its rounds within time. The longest time occupied was

8 min. 47 sec.; the shortest 5 min. 54 sec. The winners took 6 min. The time allowed was 10 min. The shot used was the 300-lb. Palliser projectile, and the gun the 9-in. 12-ton muzzle-loader.

On the 19th Sir R. Airey presented the prizes to the men of the winning detachments.

15. FATAL GUNPOWDER EXPLOSION IN THE NEW FOREST. — A terrible gunpowder explosion took place at the mills of the Schultze Gun and Powder Company (Limited), situated in the heart of the New Forest. While a man named James Mills was engaged alone in the drying house he was blown forty yards by the explosion of 740 lb. of powder. His head was buried in the earth, his clothing was found burning and full of splinters. The drying-house was blown to atoms, and bricks were found fully half a mile from the spot. A large boiler was hurled some distance, several workmen's houses were shattered, and the laboratory destroyed, but fortunately the magazine, which contained several cwt. of powder, escaped.

— BIRTHDAY OF THE EX-EMPEROR OF THE FRENCH. — The 15th of August was quietly but cordially celebrated at Chiselhurst. Some relatives of the Emperor, several friends, and some persons formerly attached to the Court had arrived from France to convey to the Sovereign, who but a year ago still reigned, the expression of their regrets, their homage, and their devotion. At eleven o'clock High Mass was celebrated in the church of Chiselhurst. At two o'clock a lunch after the English fashion was offered to all who had come to Camden House to offer their congratulations upon the fête day of Napoleon. The Emperor received from France upon this occasion a great number of letters and flowers. A bouquet of gigantic dimensions was the result of a subscription opened at Paris among the merchants, traders, and workmen. It was accompanied by a magnificent album, which contained a very sympathetic address, with several hundred signatures. Another bouquet was offered by the officers of the Imperial Guard.

16. FRENCH DEPUTATION IN IRELAND. — Great excitement was created in Ireland by the arrival of a deputation, sent by the French Aid Committee to express the thanks of the nation for the assistance afforded by the Irish Ambulance during the late war.

The visitors comprised the following persons:—Count Flavigny, the Duc de Feltre, Countess de Petray, Viscount Epanouse Cochin, Thomas Flalon, Surgeon Maguire, J. Scanlon, Count O'Neil, the Duc de Tyron, Henry O'Neill, Dr. Kniffe, M. de Lavison, M. and Madame Lesseps, M. and Madame Gallichon, Count Contecason, M. Duquet, and suite. They passed through Booterstown Square, and received the warm greetings of the populace of Ball's Bridge. They were met by a dense concourse of people. A procession was then formed, and they went through Baggot-street, Fitzwilliam-street, Nassau-street, Grafton-street, and Stephen's Green North, to the Shelborne Hotel, where some of the deputation appeared at the windows and thanked the people of Dublin for their warm reception. It was dark when they

reached the hotel, so that much of the effect of the demonstration was lost. In its most striking features it looked like a revival of the Amnesty meeting, the O'Connell procession, or the M'Manus funeral. The city resounded with discordant bands of music until after 10 o'clock.

It was announced in the programme that the Lord Mayor and the members of the Corporation would present an address, but his Lordship did not meet the deputation at the hotel. The visitors had great difficulty in getting through the mob, and cries were raised to "pitch into the police," but Mr. Martin appeared at the window and appealed to the people to conduct themselves in a becoming manner, and all passed off quietly.

The banquet which was given in the evening was scantily attended, owing to a general feeling that the demonstration was got up to display the sentiments of the Nationalist party; and, in fact, when the health of the Queen was proposed, it was received by some with hisses, many of the company remained seated, and the band struck up "St. Patrick's Day," instead of the national anthem. On the following day, an address of welcome was presented to the French visitors by the Lord Mayor and Corporation of Dublin, and they were afterwards entertained at dinner at the Vice-regal Lodge. After a few days spent in Dublin, the French Deputation went to Cork, where they were received with the greatest enthusiasm.

A monster procession was formed to accompany them from Dublin to Kingstown, when the day fixed for their departure, the 28th, arrived. "The green" was worn in profusion, and of the most varied materials, while the drums and fifes and brazen instruments were innumerable, and the performers more or less accomplished, but generally the latter. The road from Dublin to Kingstown was one long line of processionists, on foot, on horseback, in cars and carriages, and at the time fixed for the departure from the Carlisle Pier, a moderate estimate gives the number of spectators assembled in Kingstown at 40,000. Composed as they were almost exclusively of the artisan classes, and what may not inappropriately be described as the mob element, they nevertheless conducted themselves in the most orderly manner, and, so far as ascertained, there was not, either in Dublin or Kingstown, any breach of the peace.

Shortly after the crowds had dispersed at Kingstown a loud explosion of gunpowder was heard. It was found to proceed from below the obelisk erected to commemorate the landing of King George IV. at Kingstown. No injury was done to the monument, except the blackening of the stone balls supporting the plinth.

The Count de Flavigny and his party did not finally quit Ireland till the 29th.

17. THE OUTRAM MEMORIAL.—A bronze statue, which had been erected to the memory of Lieutenant-General Sir James Outram, G.C.B., was unveiled in the presence of a large assemblage of ladies and gentlemen connected with Indian affairs. The statue is placed

in the ornamental garden at the end of Whitehall, and represents the General standing on the battle-field.

19. RECEPTION OF THE PRINCESS LOUISE AT INVERARY.—The Marquis of Lornè and his royal bride were received with great enthusiasm on their first visit since their marriage to the Duke of Argyll's residence at Inverary. A select company, with the Duke's family and household servants, was assembled in the entrance-hall—a light iron and glass structure, which was adorned with ferns, shrubs, and flowering plants. The Duke's men, wearing a picturesque livery, and bearing Lochaber axes, were in attendance. When the Princess, wrapped in a shawl of Clan Campbell tartan, with a silver brooch to fasten it, alighted with her lord from the carriage, and went up the steps, received by the Duke of Argyll, there was a hearty outburst of kind feeling, to which the Marquis replied with a few words of thanks, turning back from the steps to address the crowd.

— TERRIBLE AND DISASTROUS THUNDERSTORMS.—A thunderstorm raged with considerable violence on the evening of the 19th through the counties of Gloucester, Hereford, Worcester, and Warwick. It appeared to come from the Bristol Channel and pass up the Vale of the Severn, by way of Gloucester, Cheltenham, Tewkesbury, Malvern, and Birmingham. At Worcester only the outskirts of the storm were felt. In the outlying districts of Dorset and Somerset considerable injury to property was done by the storm which prevailed on the same evening. At Ilchester two persons were struck dead by the lightning; on the Blackdown hills several trees were uprooted; at Rimpton two cows were killed and several trees were dislodged.

A peculiarly shocking case of death from lightning occurred at Abney Grange, near Bakewell, in Derbyshire. Mr. Thomas Middleton, a farmer, was seated at table taking tea with his wife, when a flash of lightning struck his residence, and descending through a bedroom at the front of the house, struck a bedstead, and then passed to the lower room, where Mr. and Mrs. Middleton were seated. The former was instantly killed, while Mrs. Middleton was injured in the leg. Robert Wright, a man in their employ, and who was also in the same room, was injured in his cheek. The effect of the lightning was such as to break the bedstead into small pieces.

The vicinity of Hamsterley, in Durham, was also visited by a most violent thunderstorm. After one of the crashes some one looking out from Hamsterley saw the farmhouse of Knavesmire, about a mile distant, occupied by Mr. Wilkinson, break out in flames. Several persons at once went up to the house, when they found Mrs. Wilkinson lying outside the door on the ground in an insensible state, her husband with his head resting on her knee and quite dead, and a child by his side struck blind with the lightning. It appears that Mr. and Mrs. Wilkinson were sitting in the kitchen having tea when a terrific flash of lightning, followed by an awful peal of thunder, took place. Both ran out to the farm-building close by, to see if the stock were safe, and as they were returning they were met in the doorway by another lightning flash. Mr.

Wilkinson was killed instantaneously, while his wife and child were blinded and rendered insensible. Mrs. Wilkinson died the following day.

21. HURRICANE IN THE WEST INDIES.—A frightful hurricane occurred in the West Indian Islands, causing great loss of life and property. The following account of it is contained in a letter written from the island of St. Thomas on the following day:—

“During Sunday [the 20th] and Sunday night the wind was rather puffy, but the barometer was steady. It did not, however, rise as it ought to have done after 4 a.m. on Monday morning, but remained steady till 9.45 a.m., and then began to fall. The hurricane commenced about 0.30 p.m.; wind, N.N.E.; very heavy squalls; barometer 29.80. From this time the barometer fell rapidly, the squalls being perfectly terrific, coming down between the hills in regular whirlwinds, carrying every thing before them, and roofs of houses, tiles, sheets of zinc, leaves, &c., were to be constantly seen whirling about in the air. From 3.30 p.m. to 5 p.m. the force of the wind was greatest, and had I not been lashed round the rail on the forecastle of the ship I was on board I should have several times been unable to hold on; men had constantly to throw themselves on the deck and hold on. At 5 p.m. the calm centre began to pass over us; this calm lasted till 5.35 p.m., and then the southerly gale came on, which was very fierce for a time, but was steady, there being no high land to influence it; whereas, in the first part of the gale the wind veered from N.N.E. to N. about 3 p.m. I think the hurricane changed its course a little about this time, the centre having got among the Virgin Islands; and there the high land and the valleys of St. Thomas made the wind come in terrific whirlwinds from N.N.W. and N.N.E.; but when the southerly gale came on, there being no land to influence the wind, it blew steadily from s. to s. by w. The barometer fell to 28.62 at 5.25 p.m., and began to rise the moment the calm centre had passed us; at 5.45 the barometer was 28.71. From this time the hurricane gradually died away, and all danger was over. There were, fortunately, very few ships in the harbour, so there was not much damage done. The English bark ‘Duke of Wellington,’ from Monte Video, and last from St. Vincent, was totally lost outside the harbour; crew all saved; and there were several small vessels—schooners and sloops, fishing boats, &c.—lost. But all the large ships rode it out in safety. There has, however, been more damage done to property on shore by this hurricane than by the one of 1867. The Royal Mail Factory is nearly destroyed, and on the eastern side of the town there is hardly a house left standing. The military hospital, the French Masonic Lodge, and several other large houses are very severely damaged, and a clean sweep has been made of all small houses, trees, &c., only three trees are left standing in Coconut-square, and the whole ground is covered with the ruins of houses. There has also been a considerable loss of life; but at present it is difficult to get any accurate accounts, as many of the

dead are still buried under the ruins of their houses. Although people say that the actual force of the wind was not so great yesterday as in 1867, still far more damage has been done, as this hurricane lasted so many more hours, and was of a much greater diameter."

The islands of Antigua and St. Kitt's, and the Leeward Islands suffered equally. In the former island many of the churches, chapels, and schools were laid in ruins, as was also the Bishop's residence, which contained an excellent library. The Bishop's daughters for many hours had no shelter but that afforded by a dining-room table, and hundreds of the inhabitants were suddenly deprived of their houses, whilst their distress was increased by the destruction of crops and fruit-trees in the line of the hurricane. Large subscriptions were immediately raised in England for the relief of the sufferers.

On the previous day, a severe shock of earthquake had been felt in the island of Jamaica.

23. INTERNATIONAL BOAT-RACE.—SUDDEN DEATH OF JAMES RENFORTH.—The International four-oared race took place this morning on the Kennebecasis River, New Brunswick, between the St. John's crew, consisting of George Price, Samuel Hutton, Elijah Ross, and Robert Fulton, and the English crew, consisting of James Percy, Robert Chambers, Henry Kelley, and James Renforth. The match was for 500*l.* a side, the English crew being allowed 200*l.* for expenses, and the excitement of the race was very great. The correspondent of the *Newcastle Daily Chronicle* gave the following description of it:—"All things being in readiness, both crews dashed their oars into the water at the same moment, and amidst the hushed suspense of the crowd, started on their journey without either side having obtained the least advantage. At the third stroke the Tyne crew showed three feet ahead, and as they gradually settled down to their work, and pulling in their usual grand style, at less than 200 yards they had increased their lead to fully half a boat's length. A few strokes after, to the practised eye of any one familiar with boat-rowing, there was manifestly something wrong with Renforth. He appeared to falter, and to pull out of stroke. The other members of the crew held gallantly on, and for the next 200 yards, they, notwithstanding Renforth's irregular rowing, maintained their lead of half a length. By the time this point was reached Renforth's condition had told its tale; he was swaying from side to side of the boat. The St. John's crew were soon level, and pulling their usual short, rapid stroke with great regularity and precision, they began to forge ahead, and by the time the boats had gone half a mile the Tyne men were nearly three lengths behind. At this point Kelley called on Renforth to make an effort, and the gallant fellow rowed on with great resolution, but evidently in a sinking condition, till one mile and a quarter of the course had been covered. The oar then dropped from his hand. Turning to Kelley he said, 'Harry, I have had something,' and then fell backward into the boat. Kelley held the poor champion, while Percy and Cham-

bers rowed the boat to Appleby's Wharf. Renforth (who was quite insensible when he was landed) was then carried from the boat on the arms of his mates, put into a conveyance, and driven a mile and a half to Claremont House, their training-quarters. Here he was laid on his own bed. Kelley took him in his arms, while Percy and I rubbed his feet. We anxiously inquired for a medical man, and mounted messengers were despatched in every direction in search of one. It was quite half an hour before one was found—the most anxious half-hour I ever passed. Before the doctor arrived our poor friend had recovered consciousness, and the first words he uttered were, 'It is not a fit I have had—I will tell you all about it directly.' He then became cold and almost pulseless. He could scarcely bear to be touched, and his mouth now and then filled with froth. Kelley, Percy, William Blakeley, and I did the best we could to keep up the circulation in his limbs, but all our efforts were unavailing. Dr. Johnson, of St. John's, who had now arrived, made a careful examination of our patient, and ordered him a little brandy and water, and directed that hot bottles should be put to his feet. Dr. M'Laren also shortly came to us, and taking out his lancet he opened a vein in each arm; but for a considerable time the blood would scarcely flow, and it became obvious that poor Renforth was sinking fast. After a brief consultation the two doctors gave us all to understand that our countryman was dying. Kelley took Renforth's head between his hands and cried bitterly. Percy, Chambers, and Bright, the remaining members of our crew, along with William Blakeley, John Adams, Robert Liddell, and myself, stood around the bed, and witnessed with ill-suppressed emotion the vigorous life of our poor friend gradually ebb away. At a quarter to nine o'clock, within two hours of the time when he had left the same house full of health and spirits, our dear comrade and England's greatest oarsman passed quietly to rest, without a struggle, and apparently without pain, in the arms of the most skilful competitor he ever had, and one of his truest friends—Harry Kelley. I have put the question of the cause of Renforth's death to Dr. M'Laren, and he informed me that in his opinion it was caused by congestion of the lungs, adding that he supposed that he was making tremendous exertions in the race when the fit seized him. An inquest will be held on the body. The melancholy news spread like wildfire, and caused tremendous sensation amongst the crowds who had congregated round Claremont House. It was thought at first that it was merely a fit, and that Renforth would soon recover from it. When the sad fact of his death became known great sorrow was expressed by all. I believe, the feeling was as sincere as I am sure it was widespread. Flags in the town of St. John were hoisted half-mast high, bells were tolled, and every outward mark of mourning and respect was shown for the poor dead Tyne-man."

At the inquest subsequently held at St. John's, Canada, the special reporter of the *Newcastle Chronicle* was the first witness examined. His evidence was to the effect that he was with the

crew as soon as they rose on Wednesday morning, and they were all well, and in excellent spirits, Renforth especially so. Witness desired some persons to accompany Renforth to the boat-house, and they did so. He followed the racing-boats, and marked the sudden change that took place in Renforth, after he had rowed about two hundred yards. He was forcibly struck with Renforth's still and livid appearance when landed from the boat. Witness, however, thought Renforth died from natural causes. Harry Kelley, the next witness, was of the same opinion, though he thought that Renforth undoubtedly believed he had been tampered with. James Percy said he breakfasted with the crew on Wednesday morning. They all ate of the same food. He did not suspect foul play. He was certain, however, that Renforth was not over-exerting himself in the boat. Judge Hezen, at the close of Percy's evidence, said the evidence was strongly against the supposition of over-exertion as the cause of death. The only other hypothesis, poison, must be inquired into. The analysis of the stomach failed to discover any traces of poison, and the jury, after a careful investigation, came to the conclusion that death had resulted from natural causes. The body was brought back to Newcastle-on-Tyne for interment.

28. LORD SHAFTESBURY IN GLASGOW.—A large meeting was held in the Glasgow Corporation Galleries on the occasion of the presentation to Lord Shaftesbury of the freedom of the City. The Lord Provost presented to his Lordship the burgess-ticket, which was enclosed in a gold box, and the noble earl made a suitable reply. In the afternoon Lord Shaftesbury laid the foundation-stone of a new Convalescent Home for Glasgow at Lenzie junction. There was a large concourse of spectators, and amongst the speakers were Lord Lawrence, Lord Shaftesbury, the Hon. A. Kinnaird, and others. The home will accommodate sixty-two convalescent patients, and will cost about 5000*l*. The Earl of Shaftesbury laid the foundation-stone of Stonefield Free Church on the 30th. After the ceremony his Lordship stepped to the front of the platform, and addressed between 6000 and 7000 persons, belonging chiefly to the working classes, who had assembled in the street below. The next day his Lordship addressed a meeting of working people, saying it was the first time he had met a large body of working Glasgow men "to thank God for the blessing upon our labours in the grant of the Ten Hours' Bill. . . . You have turned it to good account for your own honour, your own character, and for the benefit of yourselves and children. Now let me tell you the consequence of that. See what you enabled us to do by the happy, honourable, and good way in which you received that large concession and the account to which you turned it. You remember there was a time when throughout England, Scotland, and Ireland, thousands of the tenderest years toiled year after year and day after day without any intermission. You were the first who received that great boon of limitation of labour. You used it so well, and the benefits were so great to the working man in his health, his happi-

ness, and powers of education, and general condition, and the results were so beneficial to the employer, that the Legislature has risen to a sense of its great duty, and laws are now passed whereby the whole of industry is protected; and at this moment, as the result, in great measure, under God's blessing, of that good conduct, some two millions of human beings are enjoying limitation of labour, the exercise of their moral and spiritual rights, and rising in the scale of society as they deserve to do; and they show, by their good conduct, that they appreciate the good example you have set them. (Cheers.) Now, my good people, I look upon you all as my children, and I cannot express what I felt when I was asked to meet you this evening. Many of you whom I see here were not born when I began this work, and many of you were barely born when I terminated the work, and during the intervening period you laboured, or your fathers laboured, and suffered all those privations and all those afflictions of mind and body. It is now some thirty years ago since these limitations began. If I go into Yorkshire, into Lancashire, if I come into jolly old Scotland, the Land of Cakes (Cheers), I am received with as much kindness, affection, and gratitude as if all of you were the very persons who had been relieved from the intolerable toil that pressed on your energies. I feel deeply that expression of your gratitude, and, in all sincerity, I cannot tell you how deeply I respect and love you all." (Cheers.) He exhorted his audience to be careful to make the most of the opportunities now offered for the education both of themselves and of their children; impressed upon them carefully to abstain from drink; at any rate to be temperate, if not to become total abstainers, and to ensure to others, as far as lay in their power, the enjoyment of the Saturday half-holiday. In conclusion, he said, "I rejoice in the harmony that exists between employer and employed. (Hear, hear.) When we attained our great victory, I think the factory operatives of England, Ireland, and Scotland exhibited a magnanimousness of mind and greatness of heart that could not have been expected from any people whatever. There was no exultation, no over rejoicing. (Applause.) There was great and deep thankfulness, there was joyful acceptance of the great boon, but there was no attempt to triumph over the employers in saying, 'In this struggle we have gained the victory.' (Applause.) Both made concessions, both showed a desire for harmony, and see what is the result. Great was the opposition encountered in the work I undertook, but I do not believe that in the whole of the three kingdoms there will be found at this moment one employer, one occupier of a mill, who will not say that the Ten Hours Act was the greatest boon that ever was conferred, not only upon the operatives, but upon the proprietors and capitalists of the country. (Loud applause.) Now, my good friends, I see before me an enormous gathering; there is no distinction among you in my mind. (Cheers.) I see among you Scotchmen and Irishmen; I see Protestants and Roman Catholics, but there is no difference to my mind. In this

great conflict we are all in unanimity, whether we be Protestant or Roman Catholic, whether we be Scotchmen or Irishmen; we have a common Sovereign, we have a common hope, and let us, 'by the blessing of God, have one common prayer, and that shall be glory to God, and on earth peace and goodwill towards men. (Cheers.) Now, my good men, I take leave of you; I can give you no more than the hearty prayer to Almighty God, that every blessing may descend upon you and yours, your wives, your bairns, and every one you love to the very latest generation." (Prolonged applause.)

An address was then presented to Lord Shaftesbury by the factory-workers, in which they expressed their feelings of gratitude to his Lordship for having promoted the Ten Hours' Bill.

SEPTEMBER.

1. CAMPAIGN IN HAMPSHIRE.—The troops began to assemble at Aldershot, for the campaign, which it had been arranged should take place this autumn. An unusual disaster marked the commencement of the proceedings. On the 29th of August about 300 horses, seized by sudden panic, and insecurely picketted, broke loose simultaneously, running in all directions, some dragging the cords and pins, and all wearing their saddle-cloths. Large numbers of men from the various regiments at Aldershot were soon in chase, under the command of Captain Hozier and several other officers, and, as almost every open route had been taken by the fugitives, the whole locality was scoured within a circuit of at least a dozen miles. About fifty horses galloped through the town of Farnham: of these fifteen were secured, the remainder running on towards Alton and Petersfield. At Willey, about two miles beyond Farnham, the troop dashed against the closed toll-gate and smashed it to pieces, while on the commons around Farnborough and Aldershot, in the opposite direction, many plunged against stakes or other obstructions, seriously injuring themselves; others dropped through sheer exhaustion, while some found an easy death in the canal. Another stampede occurred on the 2nd of this month when seventy-six horses of the 2nd Dragoon Guards, which had just arrived that day, suddenly broke loose from the right wing of the regiment, and galloped away madly. The common ground in the locality is intersected by the Basingstoke Canal and numerous ditches, into which many of the animals plunged or fell, and were rescued with difficulty. The men of the regiment and parties from other encampments lost no time in giving chase, and by half-past two o'clock a.m. many of the fugitives were captured and brought back to the quarters on Cove Common. Some of these had reached Bagshot,

while several were secured at Farnborough, Frimley, and distant places. The lives of some of the pursuers were placed in great danger owing to their ignorance of the locality, and one man narrowly escaped drowning in a large reservoir in which three of the horses were found swimming about. About a dozen soldiers entered the water breast-high, and just as the man referred to was about to seize a horse the animal plunged away, and the poor fellow sank beyond his depth. He was, however, rescued with difficulty by two comrades, and remained for some time in an exhausted condition. Of the number that broke loose no less than twenty-four were officers' chargers, thirty-six troop-horses, and the remainder were in the sick lines at the time, having been temporarily non-effective in consequence of the previous day's march. A charger belonging to Captain Greatorrex had an eye cut out, while another broke its leg so severely that the bone protruded a considerable distance through the skin, and it was found necessary to shoot the animal.

By desire of his Royal Highness the Field Marshal Commanding-in-Chief the following officers had been appointed to represent the countries opposite their names during the autumn manœuvres:—America—Major-General J. G. Barnard and Captain S. S. Summer. Austria—Lieutenant-Colonel Franz Weikard and Major Alfons von Kodolitsch. France—Lieutenant-Colonel Berge, of the Artillery, and Lieutenant-Colonel Maury, of the Infantry, Military Attaché to the French Embassy. Germany—General von Blumenthal, Chief of the General Staff to his Imperial Highness the Crown Prince; and Major von Alten, Adjutant to his Imperial Majesty. Portugal—Vicomte de Lagres. Russia—Colonel Lanz, Horse Artillery; and Captain Baron Fredericks, Preobrajenski Regiment of the Guards. Spain—Don Gregorio Martin Lopez, Colonel of Cavalry; and Don Theodosio Noel y White, Commander of Artillery. Turkey—Colonel Riga Bey and Major Husum Bey.

The campaign opened on the 4th, when a force of 13,000 men marched out with all their camp equipage to the Sandhurst-hills and back, a distance both ways of from fourteen to eighteen miles. At Sandhurst they pitched their tents, cooked their victuals, and rested for an hour or two; the tents were then struck, and, with the remainder of the baggage, started on the way home, covered by the troops from an imaginary attack made all along their front.

On Tuesday the 5th, the whole of the field artillery paraded in the "Long Valley" before being broken up and attached in detail to the three separate divisions of the army. Fifteen batteries were present, making a total of 90 guns, a larger force than has been brought together in England for many years.

The yeomanry regiments which took part in the manœuvres at Aldershot were the Royal Berks, under command of Lieutenant-Colonel W. Honeywood; the Gloucestershire, under command of Lieutenant-Colonel the Duke of Beaufort, K.G.; the Hampshire, under command of Lieutenant-Colonel Sir H. P. St. J. Mildmay;

the Warwickshire, under command of Lieutenant-Colonel the Earl of Warwick; and the Royal Wiltshire, under command of Lieutenant-Colonel the Marquis of Aylesbury, K.G.

The whole force, exclusive of the Army Service Corps, mustered 36,000, under the general command of his Royal Highness the Duke of Cambridge, Field Marshal. It was formed into three divisions and a reserve; the first division, of 10,741 men, under Lieutenant-General Sir Hope Grant; the second division, 11,977, under Major-General Carey; the third division, 11,749, under Major-General Sir Charles Staveley. Of the regular troops—cavalry, artillery, engineers, and infantry—there were 23,000; of the militia, 8454; yeomanry cavalry, 551; and volunteers, 3847.

The limits of the tract of country assigned for this campaign were defined by a recent Act of Parliament—the Military Manœuvres Act—which provided compensation, at the cost of Government, for any damage that might be done to private property. The camp of Aldershot was the centre of this campaigning district, which extended southward from Aldershot fifteen miles, taking in Woolmer Forest to the Portsmouth Railway. It extended northward about thirteen miles from Aldershot including the Hartford Bridge Flats, Wokingham, the Chobham Ranges, Bagshot-heath, Ascot, Virginia Water, and the open country about Sandhurst. It reached eastward from Aldershot, some eight or nine miles, to Guildford and Godalming, in Surrey; westward of Aldershot it stretched more than ten miles, to Odiham and Alton. The south-western side of the area took in a portion of Hampshire and the borders of the western division of the county of Surrey, and comprised some of the wildest districts in the south of England. The Prince of Wales took the command of the cavalry brigade of the second division.

The first mimic battle of the campaign undertaken by three divisions of regular troops, militia and volunteers, took place on Saturday the 16th. The first division, comprising the Guards, under the command of Lieutenant-General Sir Hope Grant, representing the British army in defence of the road to London, was engaged at the same time in repelling the attacks of the second division, under Major-General Carey, and of the third division, under Major-General Sir Charles Staveley. The position occupied by Sir Hope Grant's force extended in front along a straight line of four or five miles, from the Hog's Back above Seale, on his left hand, to Hungry Hill, Aldershot Common, on his right hand, facing south-south-west; but his centre receded to Ash Common and Fox Hill, in the direction of Pirbright, or north-east, resting upon the southernmost spurs of the Chobham Ridges. At the same time his right wing, on Hungry Hill, Aldershot Common, was assailed by General Carey's division, which had, on the Thursday, quitted its former position of Hartford Bridge Flats, and had moved four or five miles to the south-east, near the end of the Aldershot Long Valley, occupying the line of the Basingstoke canal. Sir Hope Grant, thus attacked simultaneously at both extremities of his

position, did not attempt long to resist the passage of the Hog's Back by Sir Charles Staveley's division, but fell back on the hills, above Ash, where he maintained a formidable resistance. Meantime, his right wing was driven from Hungry Hill, and it became quite possible for General Carey to push on from Aldershot and to turn Sir Hope Grant's position on Ash Common, already assailed by Sir Charles Staveley. This was the situation of the combatants when the Duke of Cambridge put a stop to the battle. The Prince of Wales commanded the cavalry brigade of General Carey's division, and took an active part in the manœuvres at Hungry Hill. Prince Arthur was with his regiment in Sir Hope Grant's army.

The troops of all three divisions rested on Sunday. On Monday Sir Charles Staveley resumed the conflict, by sending a brigade of the 82nd Highlanders to force a passage across the river. The 42nd Highlanders opposed the attempt, and the mimic battle raged for more than an hour, when the umpire, Colonel Hamley, decided against the practicability of Sir Charles Staveley's attempt, from insufficiency of force, upon which he brought up the brigade of Major-General Brownrigg to aid that of Colonel Stephenson, and sent the cavalry, under Sir T. M'Mahon, round to the left for a flank attack on Sir Hope Grant's position. The bridge across the canal was then laid in a few minutes by the engineers, and the 82nd and 17th Regiments, running through the railway arch and across the canal bridge, hastened to the attack. The railway embankment was now occupied by their comrades. The scene, witnessed by spectators upon the railway embankment, or by the passengers in a railway-train, which came along at this time, was a very animated picture of actual fighting. The Duke of Cambridge, with his staff and the foreign officers attending these manœuvres, looked on from Bisley Common. At half-past ten Brownrigg's brigade approached along the valley to the right of Sir Hope Grant's position, and established its guns there, while General Carey brought a portion of his army (the second division) from Cove Common by way of Mitchet. The cavalry brigade of this division, under command of the Prince of Wales, had to ride across bogs and creeks, which were very trying both to horses and men. When this brigade came to the Mitchet bridge over the canal, at twenty minutes to nine, it was found that the engineers of Sir Hope Grant's army had mined the bridge, which the umpires therefore declared impassable. But the Prince, who was accompanied by General Carey and his staff, had brought a small pontoon train with him. He covered the operations of this train by some of the 10th Hussars, while a pontoon bridge was laid, and the whole of the cavalry were presently enabled to ride across; but they took no active part in the battle. The fighting was declared to be over at noon, by which time Sir Hope Grant's division had lost all its ground, and had retired northward to a new position nearer Chobham.

Fighting was resumed on Tuesday the 19th, the combined forces of Generals Carey and Staveley being directed against the position

of Sir Hope Grant, whose artillery resisted them with great energy, until the Duke of Cambridge put a stop to the conflict. Sir Hope Grant's division was considered to have successfully maintained its position. On the 21st, the fourth and last battle was fought. We have not space to give a detailed account of the action. At one period of the proceedings the Prince of Wales, at the head of his detachment of 10th Hussars, was made prisoner. His Royal Highness refused to surrender at the summons of Sir Charles Staveley, the commander of the hostile force. Sir Hope Grant on being appealed to as umpire, decided against the Prince; but no sooner had sentence been given, than the latter turned his horse and galloped away, followed by some of his staff, and though pursued, succeeded in regaining his position in safety.

On Friday the 22nd, the whole of the forces being reassembled in the Aldershot camp, were reviewed by Field Marshal the Duke of Cambridge. There was a numerous assemblage of spectators. When the review and inspection were completed, the troops all marched past the Commander-in-Chief, looking rather the better than otherwise for their fortnight's campaign. The march past occupied two hours and a half.

2. SUICIDE OF MR. WALTER MONTGOMERY.—This well-known actor, late manager of the Gaiety Theatre, shot himself in his bedroom, his wife being in an adjoining room at the time. It was stated at the inquest by the doctor who was called in, Mr. Henry Hardinge, that the pistol had been placed in the mouth, and that death must have been instantaneous. Evidence was given that Mr. Montgomery had sustained heavy pecuniary losses by his connexion with the Gaiety Theatre, and had resolved to emigrate to America. In fact, he had paid the passage-money for himself and his wife, and was to sail this week. Nobody had ever heard him threaten to kill himself, and Mr. John Stringer, late stage-manager at the Gaiety, said he did not believe the losses had any thing to do with the sad event, as Mr. Montgomery had money to meet every claim. This witness, as well as others, however, said that the deceased was of a very excitable temperament. The jury found that he committed suicide while in a state of unsound mind. Mr. Montgomery had been married only on the 30th of the previous month.

—H.M.S. "MEGERA."—Intelligence was received at the Admiralty, by telegraph from Batavia, that H.M.S. "Megæra" was run ashore, in a sinking state, at St. Paul's Island on the 19th of June, the crew and passengers all saved. The "Megæra" was an iron screw troopship, carrying six guns, of 350-horse power. The alleged unseaworthiness of this transport and her overcrowded state by troops were made subject of comment in the House of Commons, about three months since, by Mr. F. Walpole, who had a son on board. St. Paul's Island, together with that of Amsterdam, lies a little to the northward of the track from the Cape to Australia. It is often sighted by vessels, in order to prove their reckoning; and, although uninhabited, is occasionally visited for the sake of its volcanic spring of hot water.

The Admiralty received the following telegram, in reply to a telegram sent to Batavia, asking the cause of the disaster and whether provisions were landed from the "*Megara*" at St. Paul's. (In addition to her own provisions the "*Megara*" carried a considerable quantity of naval provisions destined for Sydney.)—"From Fraser, Consul, Batavia, Aug. 5, 2.51 p.m. Leak reported about June 8. Kept under for several days by hand-pumps. Leak increased; steam then used; water kept under. Insufficient coal to reach Australia; steered for St. Paul's. June 17, anchored. Survey held; diver employed; reported unsafe to proceed; hole through bottom; landed provisions; weather stormy; lost three anchors. June 19, ship was run on the bar full speed, and filled. Lieutenant Jones left July 16, all well; men under canvas; eighty tons cargo saved. Steam-ship '*Rinaldo*' left Singapore yesterday for St. Paul's, *via* Batavia." The result of the subsequent inquiry will appear farther on.

3. FENIAN AMNESTY MEETING AND RIOTS IN DUBLIN.—A demonstration was held on the Fifteen Acres, Phoenix-park, to petition for the release of the Fenian convicts at present confined in England. Mr. Smyth, M.P., occupied the chair. The number present has been variously estimated—some papers putting it at 100,000, and others as low as 5000. The majority wore green. The trades marched in procession, without bands or banners. Speeches were delivered by Mr. Nolan, secretary of the Amnesty Association, Mr. Smyth, Mr. Butt, and others, and resolutions were adopted advocating the release of the men engaged in the Manchester outrage. Mr. Smyth enunciated some remarkable views on the moral aspect of the "Manchester rescue." After the demonstration a patrol of police were attacked by the roughs and were obliged to take refuge in a barrack, with several of their number injured. A general riot followed, in which many of the police were wounded. A public-house was wrecked. At the Dublin Police Court on the following day, three men were sentenced each to six months' imprisonment for throwing stones at the police, and a number of others were sent to gaol for terms varying from one to three months. The prisoners were removed from the court under a strong escort of mounted police, who were hissed by an immense crowd of spectators.

6. COLLIERY EXPLOSION AT WIGAN.—A fearful explosion took place at Messrs. Pearson and Knowles's, Moss Pits, which occasioned the death of about seventy men.

The men in the Nine-foot and the Cannel were at work, and two sinkers were descending the upcast shaft to join their fellows below, when from the downcast came a blast like the discharge from a cannon, followed by a terrible discharge of soot and smoke from the upcast, which lasted several minutes, and was scattered by the slight breeze over the adjacent fields. At the first-named the cage, then standing on a raised platform, was whirled out of its position, and the browman had an escape which greatly terrified him, while at the

second shaft such a wreck was made of the gear that it is wonderful how the browman there, a man named Oakes, came alive from the chaos. He did sustain severe bruises, and was taken home in a cart.

Along with the poor people who had been alarmed by the report came numbers of the most practical men from the neighbouring collieries ready to lend all the aid in their power, and many colliery managers willing to advise and direct.

At each shaft parties of workmen were at once employed at the upcast in setting the winding apparatus in order, so as to draw up the hoppett which still hung in the shaft. This was accomplished in about an hour and a half, and its arrival at the surface was anxiously awaited by those who hoped against hope that the two sinkers might still be alive; but the word was "empty," and there could be no further doubt of the fate of the men. The hoppett having been sent to the bottom, and brought back again, three men entered, and were cautiously lowered to the Cannel seam, whence it shortly returned with a cargo of five colliers, who announced that all was right there, and that the explosion had occurred in the Nine-foot. The winding of the men from the Cannel was then quickly proceeded with, and all efforts were directed to the establishment of communication with below by the downcast shaft, by which alone, it appears, the Nine-foot can be reached.

When the first exploring party descended the downcast shaft they found three men alive at the face, which is placed in an upper seam known as the Four-foot. They then descended to the Nine-foot, where there were a number of dead bodies, and several colliers alive calling for water. Three were sent to the surface, and attended to, and the explorer continued their work under the superintendence of John Brigham, mining engineer, and W. Pickard, miners' agent. Pickard found the coal to be on fire, so *extincteurs* were sent down and buckets: but shortly afterwards the engineers on the pit bank were startled by a second and a third explosion of fire-damp. At the greatest possible speed consistent with safety the cage travelled from the bottom to the surface, for the winding apparatus happily had not been damaged, and after the third journey all the explorers were safe above ground, although several had very narrow escapes. A consultation was held, and it was decided to brick up the shaft, as there could be no doubt that all below were dead, and that there was the greatest danger in any further examination of the mine.

8. WATERSPOUT IN THE CHANNEL.—An extraordinary waterspout which occurred in the Channel, between Poole and Bournemouth, is thus described by Mr. Arthur Blomfield, in a letter, which we extract from the *Illustrated News*:—

"The sky and horizon had for some time worn a very curious appearance, and we had scarcely turned to row into the harbour before one of the men pointed out a whirlwind, forming a steam-like column of spray, and travelling rapidly towards land. We watched

it till it went ashore, raising a cloud of sand and dust close to the end of the Branksea property, at which point a small round tower stands on the cliff. Another whirlwind of larger dimensions was now descried, following nearly the same course, and to meet this a very distinct and well-defined cone descended from the clouds above; but before the cloud and the water actually formed a junction the shore was reached, and the cone immediately dispersed. We shortly reached the entrance of the harbour, and the rest of our sail was in smooth water. The breeze held till near sunset, when it fell dead calm; and on our return we were obliged to land at Poole and drive home, the men all prophesying that a heavy gale was coming."

11. THE NEW READING GRAMMAR SCHOOL.—The new building at Reading, of which the Prince of Wales laid the foundation-stone, in company with the Princess, in 1870, was opened by the Lord Chancellor. It has been constructed by the trustees under an Act of Parliament obtained in 1867, for the purpose of establishing at Reading a thoroughly efficient and useful school, in succession to, but with a more extended scope than, the ancient grammar school of that town. The object sought was the providing the means of a thorough middle-class education, to be supplemented by a lower school for the education and benefit of the poorer classes, and through which their children might have an opportunity of rising gradually to the principal school, and the more deserving and gifted of them be thus enabled to secure all the advantages of the higher establishment. The schools are, by the Act, placed under the management of thirteen trustees, consisting of the Mayor of Reading for the time being, the six aldermen of the borough, the Vicars for the time being of the three parishes of St. Mary, St. Giles, and St. Lawrence, Reading; and the three councillors of the borough, to be from time to time elected from the council.

—THE EMPEROR NAPOLEON AND THE EMPRESS EUGENIE.—The Emperor Napoleon (travelling as Comte de Pierrefont), accompanied by the Prince Imperial, arrived at Torquay, from Chiselhurst. His Majesty was received at the railway station by Sir Lawrence Palk. The Emperor, previous to leaving Chiselhurst, planted in the park at Camden House, a young shoot of weeping willow, brought from Longwood, St. Helena, and presented to the Prince Imperial by an English officer.

The Empress Eugenie left Camden House on Saturday, the 9th, *en route* for Spain, on a visit to her mother, the Countess Montijo. Her Majesty travelled by the South-Western Railway to Southampton, whence she embarked on board the royal mail-steamer "Oncida" for Lisbon.

12. DONCASTER RACES.—A large concourse assembled as usual to witness these races, but on the whole the racing was not so good as it had been in some previous years. The *Times* correspondent thus described the principal race:—"The Champagne Stakes brought three runners only to the post; but it is more than probable that the presence of Cremorne frightened away many animals that would

otherwise have started. His sole opponents for a stake worth a thousand pounds were Bethnal Green and Stornoway, and consequently he was made a warm favourite, there being no liability to penalties for previous successes in the race now under notice. The Derby favourite was in front throughout the last quarter of a mile of the course, and opposite the stand enclosure was running apparently within himself, while Bethnal Green was under the whip. The jockey of Cremorne, fancying he had his opponent thoroughly beaten, took a strong pull at him when rather too close home, whereupon Bethnal Green got up level, and the rider of the former was compelled to shake his horse up and to set him going again. Answering the call made upon him, Cremorne shot out from his opponent, leaving him as if standing still; whereupon his rider dropped his hands, and the horse won, hard held, by a neck."

The St. Leger, as of yore, proved all-attractive to the Yorkshiremen, who assembled in crowds to witness, not as many of them hoped, another victory for John Scott, but the success of the Newmarket mare. The withdrawal of King of the Forest, who, according to his Ascot running, where he beat Hannah easily, should have been very near winning, and the questionable positions held by Bothwell, Digby Grand, and other animals, deprived the race of the interest which it would have possessed had they all met; but, nevertheless, opinions were divided as to the result, although there could be no doubt that Baron Rothschild's filly bore off the palm for the perfection of condition. On many sides she was objected to as being a comparatively small mare, especially when viewed in juxtaposition to such large-framed animals as Albert Victor, Général, Rose of Athol, Bothwell, &c.; but what was wanting in quantity was made up in quality. The race appeared to be run at a very good pace and, although Ringwood looked dangerous at one time, opposite the enclosure, Hannah had the foot of her opponents throughout, and won easily by a length, much as Achievement did. By this running the two-year-old form of last year is confirmed, and, although from various causes in the early part of a season it seems to be utterly reversed, yet it generally re-establishes itself towards the cooler months of the autumn. The time of the race, when compared with that of previous St. Legers, is slow, but this is fully accounted for by the fact that the horses started at the first attempt, close under the rails of the new saddling enclosure, some seventy paces or more beyond the post. Indeed, few spectators believed it was the actual commencement of the race when they saw the competitors wheel into line from following one another in Indian file in the usual procession, and disappear behind the crowd at the apex of the course. On Friday the Cup was run for by a moderate field, and fell, as did the Goodwood and York Cups, to Shannon. How she would have fared had she met Hannah or Favonius, neither of whom was entered, matters not, but with her penalty for winning at Goodwood she had some difficulty in shaking off Barford, who was never before considered a horse of a very high class.

16. VERDERERS' COURT.—For the first time since 1848, a Court of Verderers for Epping Forest was held at the Castle Hotel, Woodford. The stand which has been made against enclosures and encroachments on the forest for some time has resulted in bringing about the revival of this ancient court, which has been long in abeyance; and, the proper number of verderers having been recently completed in consequence of a requisition of the freeholders, a court of "attachment" was called, whereat all forest officers were summoned to attend, "as well as such of the freeholders as might have complaints to make in regard to trespass on the rights of the Queen and all her Majesty's subjects, both rich and poor, within this ancient royal forest, who were there to be heard in open court as heretofore." At twelve o'clock, the Verderers, comprising Colonel Palmer, Sir Antonio Brady, Mr. Alderman Thomas White, and Mr. George Edward Wythes, took their seats, and a large number of persons interested were in attendance. When the list of master-keepers, purlieu-rangers, and under-keepers was called, no one answered to the first-named offices, and it was stated that most, if not all of them, had been long dead, and their places not filled up. To the call for under-keepers, Robert Runding, a hale old man, answered, and advanced to the table amidst laughter and cheers, caused by the fact that at last one out of a long list had responded to his name. He and the other under-keepers tendered presentments to the effect that various lords of the manors had at different times cut down trees, enclosed portions of the forest, and made encroachments; to which Mr. Metcalfe, solicitor to the lords of the manors, replied that these things had been done only by agreement, or purchase of the right. After some discussion, Mr. Tindal Atkinson said that it was now clear what was intended to be done,—namely, to enclose and cut down trees as fast as possible before the Commissioners under the recent Act could frame their scheme; and he called on the Verderers' Court to interfere.

Colonel Palmer stated that the Court had full powers and would exercise them. The Verderers would consider the "presentments," view the places mentioned, and give their decision at the next meeting of the Court on October 26th. At the meeting held accordingly on that day, it was decided to refer the presentments to another ancient and nearly obsolete tribunal, the Court of Swanemote.

20. MURDER OF JUSTICE NORMAN.—Mr. Justice Norman, who was acting deputy during the absence of the Lord Chief Justice at Calcutta, was murdered by a native while entering the Town Hall in that city. He had mounted the flight of steps at the entrance, when a man who had been concealed in a doorway sprang out and stabbed him in the back. The Judge turned round and was stabbed a second time in front; either wound would have been fatal, for they were directed with the accurate aim of one who was a master of the art. Mr. Norman died early the following morning. The assassin was immediately arrested. Being a Mahomedan, his act has been ascribed to the fanatical rage of the Wahabi sect, the

Puritans of Islam, against the British Government, the duty of a holy war for the expulsion of their Christian rulers being constantly preached amongst them. It seems to be the fact, however, that the motive of this crime was mixed with private vengeance, since Ameer Khan, the chief person engaged in it, had been detained in custody, under Mr. Justice Norman's warrant, upon a charge of treason and conspiracy at Patna, and a motion by counsel for his release was negatived by the decision of this Judge. Ameer Khan, with others, had subsequently been convicted, but had appealed for a new trial, pending which he seems to have been let out on bail.

The Hon. John Paxton Norman was the senior puisne barrister judge of the Bengal High Court, and was officiating as Chief Justice on this occasion. He was in his fifty-second year, having been born October 21st, 1819.

— SHIPWRECK NEAR BONCHURCH.—During a severe gale which swept the Channel on the night of the 20th, the "Underley," a fine iron ship of 900 tons, which was bound for Melbourne, with thirty emigrant passengers, was driven prow foremost on some rocks between Bonchurch and Luccombe, and stuck fast. Help was despatched at daylight from Ventnor and Shanklin, and all the passengers were saved; but the steward unhappily was drowned in the attempt to swim ashore.

21. THE ROYAL FAMILY.—The Princess Louise and the Marquis of Lorne arrived at Campbeltown, and were received by the Provost and the civic authorities with a guard of honour formed by the artillery and volunteers. A banquet and great rejoicings followed. The *Scotsman* says, "among the persons whom the Marquis and Marchioness visited, was 'Esther of the Caves,' a 'character' who now lives in a castle of her own, as she calls it, situated about two miles northward along the shore from Machariorch. She is a native of Ireland, and has been living in the caves for a great number of years. After the estate of Machariorch came into the possession of the duke, eight years ago, his Grace bestowed a sum of money upon the woman to send her to her own country. She did not, however, remain long there, and when she returned she built what is known as the Castle of Rocks, and styles herself Queen Esther. The Princess and Marquis ordered a large quantity of provisions to be sent to Esther. The Marquis presented the sum of 40*l.* to the tradesmen who turned out to the procession on Friday."

— SECOND EXPLOSION AT THE MOSS PITS.—Early this morning the news of another explosion at the Moss Pits reached Wigan, and, the rumour being that there had been a further loss of life, there was a repetition of the excitement, and the roads were quickly thronged by thousands of persons, who hastened to the scene of the disaster. A visit to the colliery about half-past seven o'clock was repaid by a sight such as has never been witnessed since the getting of coal began. Rising from the mouth of the upmost shaft was a compact volume of dense smoke, which attained so great a height that the tall chimneys of the collieries and iron-works close by

seemed like toys by its side, and which issued from the pits with a tumultuous roar that made the earth for scores of yards round vibrate as though shaken by an earthquake. High in the smoke the headgear was burning fiercely. Occasionally jets of fire shot up from the shaft into the smoke, and at the mouth of the pit a steady blaze showed that what little wood-work remained there was rapidly being consumed. The work of laying the pipes to the various sources of supply was commenced within a very short time of the explosion. The workmen were kept at work until three in the morning, when they left, it being intended that the cessation should be only for a very short time. Three police-officers were left in charge, and shortly before four o'clock they noticed that the smoke appeared to be very much increasing. They walked towards the pit for the purpose of viewing it more distinctly, and had approached within thirty yards of the crane when an immense sheet of flame and a terrific report caused them to turn and run for their lives. How they escaped injury is marvellous, for as they ran across the field they heard *débris* falling on every side, and when daylight came it was evident that there had been a perfect shower of broken timber and other materials, for it was spread over the ground in all directions. The report was heard many miles away; in villages four or five miles from the pit the houses were shaken. Gradually the great column and cloud of smoke diminished in size, and, comparatively speaking, was small in extent by half-past six o'clock; but an hour later there was another outburst of smoke and flame, which set fire to the headgear and engine-house. The steam fire-engine could not be placed nearer than 375 yards to the engine-house, and at about half-past eight the supports of the headgear gave way, and the massive iron wheels fell with a crash upon the opening of the shaft. They were broken, but not thrown down the pit; but the effect of their lying over the shaft was to reverse the ventilation for a few moments, to cause a body of smoke to issue from the downcast, and to create much terror among the bystanders, who fled in all directions. Up to this time and for many hours afterwards the sight presented by the column of smoke baffles description. The shaft is a very large one, 15 ft. in diameter, and from the mouthing the smoke rose as from a colossal engine, spreading into an enormous cloud, through which the sun could be seen by people many miles away, as through a piece of darkened glass. About nine o'clock another explosion occurred, and it was followed by several others, but none of them of any thing like the same extent.

The question whether the engineers were right in closing the shafts so soon after the first explosion had been fully canvassed among the colliers of the district and the friends of the deceased, and the inquiry into the deaths of those killed by the first explosion was being held when the second occurred. The jury did not assemble very punctually this morning, and the Coroner on their meeting referred to the fresh catastrophe, which had added five or

six more dead bodies to those to be viewed. Arrangements for flooding the pits were immediately commenced, though attended with much difficulty, in consequence of the immense amount of pressure required effectually to meet the force of the smoke at the upcast. But on the 30th the *Times* reported the quantity of water then entering the downcast shaft to amount from 70,000 to 80,000 gallons per hour, nearly 2,000,000 gallons per day. Some idea of the amount of labour involved in laying on this immense supply may be obtained from the fact that, although the work was commenced immediately after the explosion, and a large staff of men was constantly employed, it was not until late on the night of the 27th that it was completed.

30. CLOSE OF THE INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION OF 1871.—There was no closing ceremonial beyond the singing of the National Anthem. The number of visitors was—by season tickets, 1,495; on payment of 1s., 14,605: total, 16,100. The total number of persons who visited the Exhibition since its opening in May was 1,142,154. In a lecture delivered in the Albert Hall, it was stated that the greatest number of visitors was on Whit Monday, when 21,946 passed the turnstiles, and the smallest on the 18th of August, when there were only 5400. There had not been a single case of wilful injury to pictures, marble, or textile, or any instance of misconduct calling for the intervention of the police. No theft had taken place; and the arrangement which is supposed to have contributed to this gratifying result was the employment of retired policemen as check-takers at all the turnstiles. Looked at from the commercial point of view, the success of the Exhibition was complete. But one accident occurred during the season, when two ladies fell on one of the large staircases; and there was not a single quarrel or assault among the whole million and a quarter of visitors.

OCTOBER.

4. TERRIBLE COLLIERY EXPLOSION.—Another frightful colliery accident occurred at Aberdare, from an explosion of fire-damp in the Gadly coalpit, at six o'clock in the morning. As it took place at so early an hour a great number of the men had not descended the pit; but four men were killed, and three were badly burned. The rumour spread that a hundred lives were lost, and thousands of people hastened to the scene of the explosion. The morning was rather dull and hazy, as on nearly all the days on which past explosions have occurred. It is presumed that such weather retards ventilation, and thereby increases the risk of explosion.

After an inquest on the bodies, the jury returned the following verdict :—" We are of opinion that the deceased met with their deaths through an explosion of gas in the Gadlys Colliery, in Oakwell's Stall, supposed to have accumulated owing to the door being left open, and that it ignited by coming in contact with fire in some unknown way. We recommend that the company should adopt the suggestion of Mr. Wales, the Government Inspector, with reference to the increased ventilation."

— AT CHELSEA AN EXPLOSION from another cause injured thirteen persons very seriously. The scene of the accident was a six-roomed house and shop in Manor-street, occupied by William Monk, an oil and Italian merchant. He kept the cellar stored with benzoline, paraffine, gunpowder, and other explosive materials. A shopman named Wilsmore resided with his wife and children on the premises. In the morning, soon after eleven o'clock, Wilsmore descended into the cellar, in order to see if the gas was in working order. He thought all was right, and he returned to the shop. While there he heard a loud explosion, and he then recollected that he had left a lighted candle in the cellar. He cried out " Fire, fire ! " Immediately afterwards a second explosion occurred, and the whole front of the shop was blown out into the street. A crowd of upwards of 1000 persons then assembled in front of the premises. Wilsmore, who was dreadfully burnt, was rescued from the shop by some policemen. The flames spread rapidly through the whole house, and three other explosions followed. A fourth explosion caused the side of the house which lay in Manor-gardens to be blown out, and the timber and bricks were scattered in all directions. Three policemen and three firemen belonging to the brigade were terribly injured. The fire burnt with fury for over two hours; and it was only after four land-steamers and one manual engine had thrown several tons of water upon it that it became subdued. Those injured were sent in cabs to St. George's Hospital, and upon being counted upon their arrival they numbered thirteen. The police instituted a searching investigation, in order to ascertain, if possible, the origin of the fire, and arrived at the following conclusions :— First, that the fire was caused by an escape of gas in the cellar underneath the shop, and that the escaping gas became ignited by coming in contact with the candle left in the cellar by the shopman Wilsmore; and that the four following explosions were caused by the fire coming in contact with paraffine, benzoline, and gunpowder, which were all stored upon the premises.

— SOCIAL SCIENCE CONGRESS.—This year the congress met at Leeds, under the presidency of Sir John Pakington. The following were the special subjects as arranged for discussion by the Committee :—

Jurisprudence (W. Vernon Harcourt, Q.C., M.P., President) :—
1. What steps ought to be taken to establish a better system of legal education? 2. What is the best constitution of local courts, and what should be their jurisdiction? What alterations are

expedient in the laws relating to the devolution and transfer of land?

Repression of Crime Section (Lord Teignmouth, Chairman) :—

1. How far ought the cellular system of imprisonment to be adopted? and how far does it necessarily interfere with productive labour? 2. By what principles ought the amount of punishment, other than capital, to be regulated? 3. By what measures may the trading in stolen property, whether by purchasing it or receiving it in pledge, be most effectually prevented?

Education (Mr. Edward Baines, M.P., President) :—1. What are the special requirements for the improvement of the education of girls? 2. How may the education of neglected children be provided for? The question to be considered under the divisions (a), Industrial Schools and their relation to the School Boards; (b), in what form, if any, may compulsion be best applied? 3. What are the advantages and disadvantages of large as compared with small schools?

Health (Mr. George Goodwin, F.R.S., President) :—1. What are the best and most economical methods of removing and utilizing the sewage of large towns? 2. What are the best means of securing the sanitary improvement of human habitations? 3. What are the best means of promoting the health of operatives in factories and workshops?

Economy and Trade (Mr. William Newmarch, F.R.S., President) : 1. What amendments are needed in the existing laws for the licensing of houses for the sale of intoxicating liquors? 2. What principles ought to regulate the assessment and administration of local taxation? 3. Is it desirable that the State or municipality should assist in providing improved dwellings for the lower classes? and, if so, to what extent, and in what way?

Mr. Baines, in an address on the education question, gave his opinion in favour of the payment of fees in denominational schools. He recapitulated the published regulations of the London School Board, and held them up to admiration; gave an account of the educational system of Zurich; just touched upon the work done in England by Mechanics' Institutes; and described the Swedish school-fittings shown in the International Exhibition.

In the Jurisprudence Section, the question of the expediency of changes in the mode of transferring land was discussed at considerable length.

In the second division of the Economy and Trade Section, under the presidency of Mr. Mundella, M.P., a paper was read by Sir Baldwin Leighton on "Poor Law Out-Relief." He described the administration of a Union in a West Midland district, where the Board were never guided by motives of economy, falsely so called, but solely by principles. The Guardians were active and unremitting in their exertions to mitigate the frightful causes of pauperism. The death-rate had been reduced to less than 14 per 1000. Out-relief was always refused to persons of indifferent character; but

when widows or men with children applied, the Board offered to take part of the family into the House. The children were taught not only reading and writing, but also industrial work, and they had no difficulty in getting situations. The Guardians always acted upon the principle of setting a premium upon thrift, and a discount upon crime. The following figures showed the results of their labours:—In 1836 the population numbered 17,855, and the paupers 1395, or 8 per cent.; in 1856 the population was 19,000, and the paupers numbered 329, or $1\frac{3}{4}$ per cent.; and in 1870 the population had reached 19,300, but the paupers had fallen to 493, or $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. The reduction in the expenditure in the period was 100 per cent.; and the present Poor-rate was 6*d.* in the pound.

Afternoon excursions were made to places of interest in the vicinity of Leeds. One party went to the Knostrop Sewage Works, another to the Calder Farm Reformatory, a third to Kirkstall Abbey and the Norman Church at Adel, and a fourth to Roundhay-park, recently purchased by the Corporation of Leeds as a public recreation ground.

On the Sunday evening the Bishop of Winchester preached in the parish church to a crowded congregation.

Mr. Goodwin, President of the Health Section, delivered an address, in the course of which he referred to the changes in the sanitary laws and local government boards. He laid much stress on the importance of having medical officers of health independent of private practice. After briefly describing the state of Leeds with reference to the vast amount of unconsumed smoke liberated in its atmosphere, and to the excessive death-rate of some parts of the town, he alluded to a story from Calcutta, that in consequence of the effect produced upon the health of the town by recent improvements in drainage and water-supply, the undertakers were applying for compensation for loss of business, which, if not true, yet served to show what, in public opinion, the result of the work had been. Mr. Goodwin then mentioned that he had been authorized by an inhabitant of London to state that he was willing and ready to appropriate to the improvement of the health and condition of the poorer classes of the metropolis a sum equal to that given by the late George Peabody for a similar purpose—half a million of money—when he should see a mode of satisfactorily effecting this without the fear of pauperizing the classes he sought to benefit. Means had been taken to make this offer known to a limited extent, and a large number of suggestions had been sent to the proposer.

A paper was read by Dr. Leone Levi on International Arbitration, which led to a long discussion. Mr. Newmarch, President of the Economy and Trade Section, in his address on Political Economy as a science, spoke of the efforts now made to render some of its elementary doctrines matters of common school teaching, and referred to the methods pursued in France, Germany, and America.

At the final meeting of the Congress, Sir John Pakington made

some remarks in reference to a paper which had been read by Mr. Dalby on the education of the deaf and dumb. He said that great progress had been made by teaching them to watch the motions of the lips, and added, "We had a most remarkable display yesterday on the part of a gentleman from Holland, who is afflicted by being deaf and dumb. He appeared in the Education Department very kindly for the information of the public, and now through the agency of this Congress it should be borne in mind that that remarkable fact will attain a degree of publicity which it has not hitherto attained, and which probably it would have been very long ere it could attain, had it not been for the attention which was drawn to it in the Education Department."

Dr. Spark performed a selection of music almost every morning during the meeting on the superb new organ in the Town Hall.

7. FATAL FIRE IN LONDON.—A fire broke out early in the morning, in the house of Mr. Brown, chemist, at No. 98, Gray's-inn-road, Holborn. The engines were soon on the spot, and a fireman, named Ford, brought down five persons in safety with his fire-escape, and then, hearing further cries for help, he again rushed up the ladder, and was in the act of bringing down a woman, when the fire caught the canvass shoot, and the man was forced to let go his hold. The woman fell to the ground, escaping almost uninjured, but the fireman became wedged in the wire network of the escape, and was seen plunging desperately in the midst of the flames to extricate himself. When at last he did so, he fell on his head with such force as to double up his helmet. He was at once removed to the Royal Free Hospital, where he died in the evening. Much sympathy was felt for the widow and children, for whose benefit a subscription was immediately set on foot. The funeral of the gallant fireman who thus lost his life in the intrepid discharge of his duty, took place on the 14th. His body was borne on a fire-engine drawn by four horses, and followed by two large bodies of police with detachments of the fire-brigade. He was buried in Abney Park Cemetery. At the inquest, after a lengthy investigation regarding the wire-work of the fire-escape in which the unfortunate man had become entangled, the jury appended to the verdict of *Accidental Death* the observation that if the escape had been covered with wire gauze instead of wire netting, and if the canvas had been un inflammable, the fireman's life might have been saved.

—INSPECTION OF THE "GOLIATH."—A visit of inspection was paid to this vessel by Messrs. Tuffnell and Corbett, Government inspectors, and about a hundred ladies and gentlemen, for the purpose of inquiring into the result of the system adopted by the Board of Management of the Forest-gate school district, which had now been in operation some months. The Admiralty had placed this 84-gun man-of-war at the disposal of the Board, to be used as a training-ship, in lieu of building for the increased school accommodation required for the district. Most of the visitors came in the steamer which started, gaily dressed with flags, from the Charing Cross pier

at half-past ten o'clock, calling at Blackwall on its way down the river; but others, who had been deterred from taking passage in the steamer by the state of the weather in the morning, availed themselves of the train at twelve o'clock from Fenchurch-street to Grays, where the boats of the "Goliath" lay in readiness to convey visitors to the ship. These were rowed—and very creditably, too—by miniature men-of-war's-men, complete as to style, dress, and discipline; yet only a few months before they, with the other boys on board, were inmates of pauper schools and workhouses in London. The visitors were received and welcomed at the head of the companion-ladder by Captain Bouchier, R.N., and other officers of the "Goliath."

At the luncheon which was given on deck, Mr. Collins, of Poplar, made a short official statement concerning the ship and its inmates. From this it appeared that 449 boys in all had been received on board since the "Goliath" took up her station; sixteen of these had already gone into the Royal Navy, and forty others were nearly ready to follow their example. Thirteen had gone to sea in merchant-ships. For two boys situations had been found on shore, and twenty-five others had either passed to Unions not connected with the training-ship or been discharged to their friends. The number of boys on board was 393, the limit for which accommodation could be afforded being 500. Mr. Collins entered into details as to the instruction given on board, and mentioned that of the total number of boys no less than 115 were under musical instruction as bandsmen, in addition to the ordinary teaching in seamanship which all the boys alike receive. There were four bands on board, first, second, and third, in addition to a drum and fife band; and the lads according to their capabilities, passed from one into the other. There were also on board 160 treble and second singers regularly trained, and for the gratification of the company as they sate at lunch a species of concert, vocal and instrumental, was given by the young performers, who could not be seen, for they were screened from sight by a drapery of flags, but whose performances were very creditable. For young musicians there is, it seems, a demand in the army, and it was stated that a list of thirty adepts had been forwarded to the Horse Guards within the last few days. The new swimming-bath reached the "Goliath" in June; there were then only twenty-nine boys who could swim, now there were 185.

Prizes procured by private subscription were distributed among the most deserving of the boys. They were rewarded for seamanship, for smartness aloft, for the best sailmakers, best coxswains of boats, best tailors, shoemakers, carpenters, painters, buglers, &c.; there were also prizes for the best swimmers, best captains of messes, for the boys who kept their clothes or band instruments in the best order, one for the boy who had attended most carefully to the sick, and two for the most popular boys in the ship. The latter prizes had been awarded according to a species of informal and unconscious *plébiscite* on the part of the boys themselves. There were five

"popular boys" nominated: for one of these—a small dark, round-faced urchin—every boy in the ship voted; the next on the list had a little over 50 per cent. of the crew in his favour; and if names be any guide to nationality, both these boys ought to hail from the sister island. To five of the boys silver medals were given for special good conduct, and these enjoyed the distinction of standing in the front row, and having their honours fastened on by Miss Bourchier, daughter of the Captain.

The following minute was left upon the ship's books by Mr. Tuffnell, before taking his departure:—

"Oct. 7th.

"I have in several late visits examined the School in all its departments, and can conscientiously speak in the highest terms of commendation of the general arrangements, the efficient way in which the several officers discharge their duties, and as a necessary consequence, of the satisfactory examination passed by the children both in the intellectual and industrial departments.

"E. C. TUFFNELL, Her Majesty's Inspector of Schools."

8. MURDER OF MRS. WATSON.—One of the most remarkable murders of recent date was perpetrated in London. The victim was the wife of the Rev. T. Selby Watson, M.A., a clergyman well known in London, having for upwards of twenty-five years filled the important position of head-master of Stockwell Grammar School. The murderer was her husband. The deed was effected on a Sunday evening, at a time when Mr. and Mrs. Watson were alone in the house. The servant went out in the evening, and when she left, Mr. Watson and his wife were sitting in the library on the first floor, which was situated between Mr. Watson's bedroom and a small bedroom unoccupied at the back. When she returned, at ten o'clock, Mr. Watson told her that her mistress had left for the country, and would be absent five or six days. He himself went to bed at the usual hour, and on the following day got up and busily occupied himself with writing and putting his books in order. He spent the Monday and Tuesday in the same way, and on the Wednesday, after getting up, went to bed again, and took a dose of poison. The surgeon being called in found a letter addressed to him in the handwriting of Mr. Watson, in which that gentleman acknowledged that he had "killed his wife in a fit of fury," and added that her body would be found "in a little room off the library." Thither the surgeon and the servant went, and there they found the body of Mrs. Watson, in a corner of the room, with her knees touching her chest, her hands convulsively clenched, and her clothes saturated with blood, which still seemed to ooze from the body in a dark, almost purple pool. On examining her the surgeon found that there was, in addition to numerous other wounds, a fracture on the occiput sufficient, probably, to cause death. Both temples were beaten in, and there was a deep wound in the middle of the forehead. The poison taken by the wretched husband proved ineffectual, and he was charged before the magistrates with the crime of wilful murder, and committed for trial. Mr. Watson

was well known in the literary world, as translator of several classical works published in Bohn's library.

9. THE SECOND OCTOBER NEWMARKET MEETING.—The most important days were the Cesarewitch day on Tuesday, the 10th, and the Middle Park Plate on the Wednesday. Of the former day the *Times* reporter said, "At the risk of the theme of the weather being tedious, we must again repeat that in the memory of the oldest *habitué* never was such a Cambridgeshire day as this one remembered since Lanercost won it thirty-two years ago. The wind was due south, and the sun warm, and the attendance was unusually good, including, in addition to the usual leading racing men, the Prince of Wales, who came down from St. Pancras by the special train. The start was delayed quite half an hour through the fractiousness of White Slave, and her breaking away in company with Noyre Tauren, White Rose, Mahomet, Marmora, Black Gown, &c., but at length the flag fell, and they streamed past the Rowley mile Stand with the colours of Bicycle, Vestminster, Allbrook, Sister Helen, Sterling, and Sabinus showing in front. It was only close home that Sabinus drew up, just winning by a short head, and Sterling and Allbrook making a dead heat for second place. Noyre Tauren somewhat redeemed his character by being fourth, but Favonius never improved his position, while Henry, after the first half-mile, was never in it, a result so unexpected as to be almost inexplicable, save that he was 'chopped' at the start.

"The show in the Birdcage is always one of the most interesting things connected with the Middle Park, and this year, as in the previous ones, criticisms were plentiful, and as various as the many colours of the jockeys. Helmet was the favourite, and Nuneham and Almoner were backed, perhaps, for as much money as any thing in the race. There were one or two very big ones among the sixteen starters, and Vanderdecken and Prince Charlie looked as if they could have carried some of the field. Prince Charlie, from Joseph Dawson's stable, a good-looking son of Blair Athol, was known to be much fancied by his stable, and the Baron had Laburnum, very well shaped and perfectly fit. Helmet was one of the first beaten. Almoner could only get fourth, and Nuneham was a very moderate third, while Prince Charlie made all the running, and was apparently going to walk in when Maidment brought up Laburnum and challenged Prince Charlie half way up the hill; a fine race home being given in favour of the latter by a head. The afternoon racing was brought to a close by the totally unexpected defeat of Albert Victor with odds of 3 to 1 on him by Somno in the Select Stakes, a sensation that backers who had had a bad day could have well spared."

— THE SETTLEMENT OF THE ENGINEERS' STRIKE.—This monster strike, which had been protracted ever since the end of May, was at length brought to a close, by the exertions of Mr. Philipson, the town clerk of Newcastle, on the part of the employers, and Mr. Cowen on that of the men. These gentlemen, undeterred by the

failure of Mr. Mundella and other mediators, met together on Friday the 6th, and concerted a programme on which they conferred on the 9th, with Sir William Armstrong, as representative of the masters generally, and with Mr. Burnett, the President of the Nine Hours' League. The terms were submitted to the contending parties and were accepted. Mr. Philipson signed the document on behalf of the employers, and Mr. Cowen on behalf of the men. This strike which has been the most prolonged and resolute ever known in England, originated in a desire on the part of the Newcastle men to place themselves on a footing with the men of Sunderland, who had obtained the boon they coveted, that is the reduction of the working time of the trade from ten to nine hours, the wages remaining as before. About 8000 men had left the works, and foreigners were employed to take their place. The terms of the compromise which was now arranged were, that the reduction of hours should be conceded by the masters, the men agreeing to work for the same rate of wages as before; and for a few subsequent months they engaged to work overtime if needful. The event was hailed with great rejoicing all over Tyneside. Flags were hung out of the windows of the meeting-houses of the engineers, and the people every where congratulated themselves and their neighbours on the happy termination of the contest.

In Trafalgar-square an evening demonstration by lime-light, of the trades and working men of London, was held for the purpose of congratulating the engineers of Newcastle on the event. Mr. Odger addressed the crowd, and after announcing the intelligence just received, said the meeting had originally been called for the purpose of aiding the men of Newcastle in their struggle, but it had happily been turned into one of congratulation at the victory they had obtained. The men of Newcastle had done their work well, and were worthy of all praise. He hoped they would be as moderate in the hour of victory as they had been in the heat of the battle. He hoped the struggle at Newcastle was but the precursor of a movement throughout the whole country for a reduction of the hours of labour. They must, however, recollect that to make such a movement successful there must be thorough organization.

Mr. Wilson, assistant secretary of the Amalgamated Engineers' Society, moved the following resolution, which was carried by acclamation:—

“That this meeting expresses its satisfaction at the favourable settlement of the protracted and manfully contested strike at Newcastle for the nine hours, and records its admiration at the enduring, self-denying, and persistent spirit of the men, who, for the common good of their class, have so long sustained a contest with moderation and honour that will mark an event in the industrial history of the nation.”

Many other bodies of artisans, engineers, and labourers throughout the country continued still on strike for the same principle—the reduction of working-hours,—and in some cases for an advance

of wages also. The affair of the colliers of the Forest of Dean, who had left work for many weeks, was not settled till near the end of October. At Wolverhampton the colliery proprietors advanced wages 6*d.* a day. Similar concessions in various places were made by the employers.

The agitators of the Nine Hours Movement League held meetings to disseminate their principles in the chief towns and manufacturing districts throughout the kingdom.

10. CHURCH CONGRESS AT NOTTINGHAM.—The Congress this year met at Nottingham. The Bishop of Lincoln presided. On the morning of the 10th the Bishop of Manchester preached at St. Mary's Church. He spoke of the scientific inquiries of the day, and their agreement with the truths of Christian revelation. In the afternoon the Bishop of Lincoln delivered the inaugural address in the Mechanics' Hall—a review of the progress of the Christian faith during the last 300 years. Papers were read by the Bishop Suffragan of Nottingham, the Rev. W. Farrer (the Head Master of Marlborough College), the Rev. Prebendary Harold, and the Rev. Dr. Butler. The Congress was brought to a close in the evening with a *conversazione* given by the Mayor, Mr. John Manning, in the Mechanics' Hall. More than 2200 guests were present at the final meeting of the Congress, which was held during the evening. Leeds was chosen as the place of meeting in 1872. The Bishop of Lincoln said the hospitality of the Mayor and of the whole town of Nottingham had been princely.

12. MANSION HOUSE FUND FOR CHICAGO.—The Lord Mayor of London, Alderman Dakin, opened a public subscription for the relief of the sufferers in the awful conflagration of the 8th and 9th at Chicago, in which about one-third of that prosperous commercial city was destroyed, and 80,000 people rendered homeless. The intelligence of the catastrophe had been received by telegram from New York. The large sum of 10,000*l.* was subscribed at once. The American residents in London met at the Langham Hotel, General Schenk presiding, for the same purpose. On the 13th, at a special Court of Common Council, convened on a numerously-signed requisition, the Lord Mayor, on taking the chair, said he had called the meeting at a short notice, but he was convinced that the Court would feel that the sudden and disastrous calamity which had befallen the great nation across the Atlantic by the widespread destruction in one of her finest cities would justify his responding to a requisition so numerously signed. The saying "*Bis dat qui cito dat*," he said, was eminently applicable to the emergency. Mr. Bedford moved the following resolution, which was carried unanimously :—"That this Court has heard with feelings of profound regret of the terrible calamity that has befallen the city of Chicago; that, being desirous of testifying as early as possible its deep sympathy with the people of America on the occasion of what may be truly called a national calamity, hereby subscribes the sum of 1000 guineas, and directs that it may be forwarded immediately, and applied to the relief of the most urgent cases of distress."

Meetings were convened and subscriptions opened in the principal commercial towns throughout England and Scotland for the same purpose.

16. FATAL ACCIDENT ON THE NORTH BRITISH RAILWAY.—The afternoon express train from Helensburgh had arrived within half a mile of the Ferryhill station, when the driver saw that the danger signal was up, and he at once lessened the speed of the train and whistled. This was followed by the lowering of the danger signal, which is always accepted as giving liberty to proceed. The driver accordingly put on full speed, but had scarcely done so when he saw a travelling crane standing on the down line with its point projecting over the six feet of clear space which separates the up and down lines. The driver reversed the engine and put on the breaks, but was unable to bring the train to a standstill in time to avert a collision, which took place about forty yards from the station. The travelling crane first crushed in the boiler, carrying away the safety valve, then tilted over the boiler and tender across the roof of a first-class carriage, and finally crashed through the roof of a third-class compartment, killing a young woman and a boy, and tearing away the side of the compartment. The train ran on to some little distance beyond the station before it was brought up. Only those passengers who were in the third-class compartment which was smashed received personal injuries. These were fifteen in number, and some of them were seriously injured.

17. FUNERAL OF SIR JOHN BURGoyNE, GOVERNOR OF THE TOWER.—The little chapel of St. Peter ad Vincula in the Tower was by command of the Queen selected as the burial-place of this gallant veteran officer, and the funeral ceremonies were conducted with almost the pomp of a State funeral. Royal recognition was shown by the attendance of representatives of her Majesty and the Prince of Wales in the royal carriages which formed part of the funeral procession. The mourners assembled at the house of the deceased Field-Marshal in Pembroke-square, Bayswater, and the body was borne in a hearse, followed by four mourning coaches and the royal carriages, and went at a walking pace the whole way. The route was by way of Oxford-street, along Holborn, over the new Viaduct, and thence through Cheapside to Tower-hill. Many of the shops along the route were closed while the procession passed, and on the Thames most of the vessels dropped their flags to half-mast high. The Tower was closed to the general public, but officers in uniform of all services were admitted, and there was also a large assemblage of spectators who had been invited, all of whom were in mourning. As many as could be accommodated were admitted to the chapel where the burial took place. The Duke of Cambridge and Prince Edward of Saxe Weimar were among them.

18. MM. LEON SAY AND VAUTRAIN AT THE MANSION HOUSE.—The Lord Mayor and the Lady Mayoress entertained M. Léon Say, the Prefect of the Seine, and M. Vautrain, the President of the

Municipal Council of Paris, at dinner at the Mansion House. The company numbered about 120. The principal toasts were responded to by Lord Lyons, Lord Beauchamp, Mr. Kirkman Hodgson, M.P., M. Léon Say, M. Vautrain, the Bishop of Winchester, and Archbishop Manning. M. Say, speaking of the Anglo-French commercial treaty, said he thought it would be a great misfortune if the treaty were repudiated, as the result would be to give an impetus to the Protectionist party, the result of which would be disastrous to both countries.

On the 19th M.M. Say and Vautrain attended a meeting of the Common Council at the Guildhall, and presented an address, together with a model in bronze of the Hotel de Ville before its destruction, to the City of London, in token of gratitude for the succour it had rendered to Paris in February last.

M. Vautrain, as the President of the Municipal Council of Paris, addressing the Court, said his honoured friend, M. Say, and he had been sent by that body to express to the Lord Mayor and to the citizens of London their deep thankfulness for the sympathy and the material aid shown towards the people of Paris on the siege being raised. He mentioned a touching fact, that while the food sent from this country was being distributed, some who were not in absolute want said that, though they were not in need of the bread which was being given away, they would break it in their families in remembrance of the feeling evinced towards them by the English people.

The French people, it was said, were much gratified with the reception their distinguished countrymen had met with in London.

19. THE EMPEROR NAPOLEON.—The Emperor Napoleon returned to Camden House, Chiselmurst, accompanied by the Prince Imperial, attended by Prince Joachim Murat, Count Clary, Count Davilliers, Dr. Baron Corvisart, and others, who had remained with the Emperor during his recent stay at Torquay. On the return journey the Emperor was at all points received with every demonstration of kindly feeling, and at Bath particularly nothing could exceed the heartiness of the welcome extended to him by upwards of 2000 persons who had assembled at the station.

— INTERNATIONAL YACHT RACES.—A series of international yacht races for the Queen's Cup, which was won by the celebrated schooner-yacht "America" in 1851, took place near New York between Mr. Ashbury's yacht, the "Livonia," and vessels selected by the New York Yacht Club. The days selected for the races were October 16, 18, 19, 21, 23, 24, and 25. In the first race, the American champion, the "Columbia," beat the "Livonia;" in the second, the same vessel won the race; in the third, the "Columbia" again competed and lost; in the fourth, the "Sappho" beat the "Livonia." This victory gave the Yacht Club a score of three to one, and much interest consequently was felt in the fifth race, as it was the deciding contest if the Yacht Club won it, giving them four out of seven. The "Sappho" was again elected as competitor to the "Livonia." The

start was made at 11 a.m. At 1 o'clock the "Sappho" was three minutes and a half ahead. At 1.40 p.m. the Lightship was rounded, and on the way home the "Sappho" led by half a mile. There was a good breeze, and the "Sappho" won the race.

23. AGRARIAN MURDER IN MEATH.—An atrocious murder was committed in the county of Meath. Mr. Edward Bryan, a farmer residing at Carrick Springer, near Moynalty, was shot dead in his own house. Deceased had held thirty-five acres, at 30s. an acre, under Dr. Sadleir, who managed the property for the Board of Trinity College. He had allowed his nephew Peter Brian to occupy a small hut at one end of the farm, but recently desired to get possession of the holding, and took proceedings to evict. When the case came before the magistrates they suggested that, as it was a family dispute, it should be settled by the arbitration of the Rev. Mr. Ginty, P.P., and the result was an arrangement that young Brian was to get 10% to take him to America. He was not satisfied with the award, and remained on the land until Sunday, the 23rd, when the deceased told him he should be put out on the following day. There was no expression of ill feeling on his part, nor any threat by others. It is a curious fact that a few hours before the murder was committed Mr. Sadleir had been speaking to the assembled tenants about granting leases of their holdings. At the inquest but little additional information was elicited. Margaret Cussen, niece of the murdered man, stated that she was sitting at a table, on which was a lighted lamp, about half-past six o'clock on Sunday night, reading a newspaper, while the deceased was seated on a stool, with his back to the window, facing the door. The inner door of the porch was closed, but the outer one was open. She heard a noise like an explosion in the chimney, or in a pot which was on the fire, and thought the deceased had fainted. She shook him, but he never spoke, and she saw that he was dead, as he had been in perfectly sound health a moment before. She ran for his wife, who would not believe that he was dead. She had not then observed that the glass of the window behind was broken. She had not seen any one about the place. Dr. Ringwood deposed that there were six gunshot wounds in the back of the neck, any one of which would have been sufficient to cause instantaneous death. It was impossible that the deceased himself could have inflicted the wounds. The jury returned a verdict of "Wilful murder against some person unknown." Brian, the nephew, was taken into custody.

24. FATAL FALL IN HUNTING.—Mr. W. Rigden, of Faversham, master of the Tichborne hounds, was thrown from his horse in the hunting-field, and killed instantaneously. Though seventy-nine years of age, Mr. Rigden was always to be found with his hounds, and at the time of the accident he was riding along the grass in a line in a sharp burst, near Leeds Castle, when his horse put his foot in a hole, and not being able to recover itself, it threw its rider heavily on his head, and the fall dislocated his neck.

— SIEGE OPERATIONS AT CHATHAM.—The Commander-in-Chief held his annual inspection of field-works in connexion with the school of military engineering at Chatham on a much grander scale than usual. A mimic siege in which about 4000 troops took part, was the leading feature of the day's operations. The Duke arrived early, accompanied by his staff, and by many foreign officers of distinction who were visiting this country. Thousands of spectators manned the lofty bastions of the Chatham lines. We subjoin the following short sketch of the day's work.

First came the explosion of the mines which have for some months been the scene of mimic underground war between a supposed attacking and defending force, the realities of actual service being imitated even so far as frequently nearly to suffocate some of the belligerents. The mines of the attacking force were exploded and a lodgment effected and quickly entrenched by a party of Guardsmen, who showed by their skill and energy that they valued the privilege of receiving instruction in the more scientific work of their profession.

The effects of charges of gun-cotton, as compared with gunpowder, were shown by the explosion of 40 lbs. of the former against 100 lbs. of the latter laid loosely against a formidable stockade. The smallness of the bulk of gun-cotton, and consequently the ease with which it can be handled by a very few men, gain it a great practical advantage over its rival. Its effect on the stockade was at least equal to, if it did not surpass, that of the gunpowder. The great beams of timber were more cleanly cut through, and if at first the power of the gunpowder, judged by its effect on a second stockade placed to protect a wall in rear, seemed greater, a more careful examination proved that the second stockade had been injured by the falling timber, and not by the gas evolved. The torpedo explosions were, however, even more striking. Six mines extending across the Medway, and charged with only 50 lbs. of gun-cotton, placed ten feet below the surface of the water, were exploded successively, the columns of water being thrown up in masses far exceeding, and in height surpassing, the most famous fountains. This explosion was followed by a more practical experiment. A steamer, supposed to be a friendly vessel, was allowed to pass harmlessly over the torpedo, while a raft towed behind it, and carrying some figures which some believed to be men, was blown into fragments as it crossed the spot where its buried enemy lay concealed. The actual charges in war would be from 100 lbs. to 500 lbs., and their effect may be anticipated from the results obtained from the small charges actually employed.

Following the mining operations were the trials of the new boat pontoons of wood and canvas against the old red cylinders known as Blanshard's pontoons. Bridges of both descriptions had been constructed across the bathing-pond, which, owing to its stillness and want of stream or tide, scarcely afforded a proper test of their powers when in use on service. A steam sapper, or traction engine, passed safely along the roadway supported by the new pontoons,

being very skilfully driven by its conductor, and a sixty-four pounder gun, weighing $98\frac{3}{4}$ cwt., which crossed and recrossed at great risk but yet in safety, broke through and was precipitated into the water when passing over the bridge of Blanshard's pontoons.

The spar bridges and suspension bridges, especially one constructed of Jones's iron gabions buckled together, were well worthy of close inspection; while the numerous earthworks and batteries, showing every variety employed in war, afforded a practical exemplification of field engineering as invaluable to officers who are studying for their examinations as interesting to all who really care for the military profession.

Although the afternoon's operations may have been more amusing to the unprofessional spectator, the morning's experiments were of greater interest to those who entered more deeply into the subject. The attack on the lines shared the many inconsistencies and almost absurdities which are inseparable from sham fights when the combatants actually meet. There were assaults from the parallels and lodgments repelled by sorties from the garrison, there was firing from the batteries, explosions of mines, and, finally, escalading; but although the whole scene served as a sample of mimic warfare, there were incongruities which somewhat destroyed its effect. Some of the regiments failed to avail themselves of cover, and showed ignorance of the principles of skirmishing—notably one detachment, which knelt down in line behind a post and rail fence in front of a strong earthwork occupied in force by the enemy. The volunteers engaged did their work well; and indeed the only arm of the service which appeared out of place was a detachment of dragoons, whose horses, it must be supposed, had been spared during the long siege, and who sacrificed themselves by charging across a small open space under the heavy fire of infantry securely entrenched. This movement was no doubt a false one, but it clearly arose from anxiety on the part of the general to utilize in some form all the force under his command.

The day terminated with a march past in the Brompton barracks, the Commander-in-Chief and the visitors from London returning by an evening train. Samples of nearly all that engineering art could show of war had been compressed into one day's inspection; and if success be a criterion of skill, talent, and labour, the officers and men of the Royal Engineers may be rightly congratulated on the results attained. The march past resembled all other parades. The troops looked well, the volunteer engineers presenting a soldier-like appearance.

25. COLLIERY EXPLOSION AT SEAHAM.—Another fearful colliery explosion occurred, which caused the deaths of twenty-eight men and boys, and a great number of horses. Seaham colliery is about six miles from Sunderland, and is the property of Earl Vane. The explosion, which occurred about half-past eleven o'clock at night, was coincident with the firing of a shot by a stoneman, who was engaged in blasting a mass of stonework. In the village and at the town of Seaham

Harbour the shock of the explosion was distinctly felt. Great alarm and consternation prevailed, the general opinion being that an earthquake had occurred. The older and more experienced pitmen, however, soon divined the real cause, and in a short time there was a rush towards the pit-shafts. It was found that the masonry on the south side of shaft No. 3 had been blown down and scattered to a distance, and the iron-work violently torn. No hope was entertained from the first of recovering alive the twenty-nine or thirty men and boys who were known to be in that pit. The other shafts were uninjured, and the miners engaged in them escaped.

NOVEMBER.

1. WRECK OF THE "RANGOON."—This Peninsular and Oriental Company's Steamer, with passengers and mails for Australia, struck on the Kadir Rock, about a mile from the mouth of the Point de Galle Harbour at 6 p.m. and sank six hours afterwards. The "Rangoon," an iron ship of 78,000*l.* value and 1780 tons burden, was commanded by one of the oldest of the Peninsular and Oriental Company's officers, Captain Skottowe, who upon this occasion was making his last trip before retiring from the service, having never previously met with a casualty. The purser of the ship, Mr. Liversage, was wrecked for the second time, he having been on board the "Colombo" when that vessel was lost. The wrecked vessel had taken on board the Australian mails and passengers arriving by the Indus from Suez on the previous day.

Intelligence of the disaster reached Leadenhall-street nine hours after its occurrence. We subjoin extracts from a letter of Lieutenant Bridges, which appeared in the *Times* of November 29.

"Leaving the harbour last night at 6 p.m., pilot on board, almost dark when we weighed, we struck on one of the numerous reefs at the entrance, and the ship sunk in 5½ hours in 12 fathoms, about 4½ miles off the mouth of the harbour. Most providentially there were (a most unusual thing) two ships at anchor out there waiting to come into the harbour, or, at the very least, the discomforts would have been very great, and probably great loss of life. We left at six, as I said, leaving the mail-boat behind. When we got about half a mile out she came out to us; we stopped about ten or fifteen minutes to hoist her up, and it was then the current drifted us broadside on out of the channel, and when we went ahead again straight, thinking, I suppose, we were still in the channel, she struck a reef on the right hand side of it, first starboard side forward, then the keel aft, and bumped very heavily, came off, and commenced filling. We anchored, but kept for a short time turning ahead to keep the engine-pumps going, and parted the cable, then

anchored again much farther off. Fires were put out, and she filled fast. . . . We got all the women away in the life-boat about seven, . . . and then we got every body else away, and all went on board a ship at anchor outside. I left in last boat, but about nine borrowed one of the boats of the ship we were on board and went back. Found the ship deserted. . . . Met the captain, and with the aid of, first of all, eight Lascars and one officer, and assisted afterwards by two stewards and two more officers, saved much of the cabin baggage and nine bags of mails. I left about 11.40 p.m. awfully and entirely 'done up,' and couldn't get my boat to stay longer; but I brought away as much as she would hold, and there was too much water on the main deck to do much, and a heavy swell rolling her so much. The most curious part of the affair is that we got no assistance, or a boat even, till ten, though close to the harbour; two Peninsular and Oriental ships and two Trinity Lighthouse craft, all with fires banked, in the harbour; and we fired four guns and burnt dozens of blue lights and rockets; but they thought we were communicating with the China steamer, the arrangement being that if we met the China steamer outside (which we ought to have met here, but she was overdue and we left), we were to attract her attention and take the mails from her; and in the harbour they thought we were doing this. Once a pilot went to the Master Attendant and told him the 'Rangoon' was on shore; he manned his boat and went outside to look, thought he saw the two steamers communicating, came in again, and went out to dinner, the pilot being also convinced it was a mistake and apologizing for spreading a false report."

The passengers and crew were all saved, but a considerable portion of the mails and baggage sank.

2. STRANGE DISCOVERIES.—Some workmen making excavations while at Hampton Court Palace discovered two human skeletons lying within about two feet of the surface. The bones, those of two full-grown male persons, were found in good preservation, considering that, from the condition of the skeletons, it is estimated that they had been buried not less than 150 or 200 years. The part of the palace in which they have been discovered, however, was rebuilt by Sir Christopher Wren in about the year 1690, and if they had occupied their present position at that time they could not fail to have been disturbed in the progress of the alterations. After this rebuilding by Sir Christopher Wren the palace was occupied by King William III. and Mary, who frequently made this the residence of their Court; indeed, it was, as is well known, at Hampton Court that King William met with the accident which caused his death in 1702. It seems probable, therefore, that the skeletons date from about that period. That the interment, whenever it was made, was performed hastily and secretly is evident from the position in which they were found, as well as from the fact of lime having been used to hasten the decomposition of the bodies. On the same day a curious discovery was made in Scotland of a perfectly clothed

skeleton. A labourer was engaged in trenching at Racks, about five miles from Dumfries, with a view of reclaiming a portion of the Lochar Moss, at that place, when he came upon what turned out to be human remains. Darkness coming on, further investigation was deferred until the next morning, when there was found the trunk of a man's body with the bones and clothing in a remarkable state of preservation, lying about nine inches below the surface. The coating of peat had been previously removed, so that originally the remains were embedded much deeper in the moss. The skeleton was headless; the garment in which it was clothed was of a coarse woollen texture, and the boots were of the most primitive description, resembling specimens displayed in the Antiquarian Museum in Edinburgh, each boot being one piece of leather, awkwardly drawn into the shape of the foot by stitching up the back and front, and tied with strong pieces of the same material. It is believed the skeleton must have lain in the moss from a remote period.

3. HAMPSTEAD SMALL-POX HOSPITAL.—A long and patient inquiry into the management of this institution was brought to a close this day. The hospital is a temporary building erected under the powers given to the Poor-Law Board in Gathorne Hardy's Act of 1867, to meet the epidemic of 1870-71. It was under the general management of the Metropolitan Asylums Board.

The details of the proceedings before the Commissioner occupied a considerable space in the daily papers from the period of their commencement on September 21st. Mr. Henley and Dr. Buchanan were the inspectors appointed by the Local Board. The inquiry originated in the loss of a child named Elizabeth Bellue, a patient who, as it appeared from the books, had been discharged on the 31st of May; she had never been restored to her parents, and there was no clue to her present whereabouts. In the course of the inquiry several discharged patients made statements of shocking acts of cruelty and negligence on the part of the medical officers and nurses, as well as of a general deficiency of proper accommodation and requisites for the inmates. These statements were contradicted by the medical officers and visitors and others examined. The Commissioners reserved their opinion. A further inquiry was entered into a few days later respecting the fate of the missing child, but without success.

—TRANSFER OF COLUMBIA MARKET.—This building, the noble gift of the Baroness Burdett Coutts to the Corporation of the city of London, was formally handed over to the Lord Mayor this day. A portion of the market had been curtained in, and decorated with a few banners and exotic plants. On either side were ranged the children of St. Thomas's School, which adjoins the market, and beyond these were the Columbia Shoe-Black Brigade and the members of the Baroness Burdett Coutts' Sewing School. Among those who took part in the ceremony were the Lord Mayor elect, Lord St. Leonards, the Earl of Harrowby, and most of the leading members of the Corporation.

4. PROFESSOR HUXLEY AT MANCHESTER.—At the distribution of prizes to the successful students in the Oxford local examinations at the Manchester centre, Professor Huxley in an interesting address adverted to the great changes which have taken place in our own day in the Universities, and the further reforms which are shadowed forth in Mr. Gladstone's recent letter to the two Vice-Chancellors. He (the Professor) pointed out, in justice to the University of Oxford, that the reforms which had been effected therein have not been altogether due to external pressure, and that the Premier may look forward with confidence to influential co-operation from within the University in his attempt to give a wider usefulness to its great revenues. The Professor remarked that nowhere in the world was there a better school, so far as it went, for the teaching of all the great branches of physical science than was at the present time to be found within the University of Oxford. It was a fact that within the last ten or fifteen years that noble institution had devoted 100,000*l.* to the endowment of physical science teachers. The Manchester Grammar School came in for an emphatic word of praise from the Professor for the manner in which it is affording scientific instruction.

— THE ELCHO SHIELD.—The Elcho Shield won this year by English marksmen, was, with some ceremonial, entrusted to the keeping of the Corporation of London. A muster of the various rifle corps took place in Finsbury-square, and they then marched to the Guildhall, where the Lord Mayor, in the name of the City of London, took charge of the shield. It was won by the Scotch team last year.

— OPENING OF QUEEN VICTORIA-STREET.—This day the new street, from the Mansion House to the Thames Embankment at Blackfriars Bridge, was opened to the public. There was hardly any ceremonial, but a large number of spectators congregated. The Lord Mayor, in civic array, and Colonel Hogg and the leading members of the Metropolitan Board of Works were present. In the evening the Board of Works entertained the Corporation at a banquet at the Albion Tavern.

Queen Victoria-street may be regarded as the last and completing portion of a commodious thoroughfare which extends from the Houses of Parliament to the Mansion House, and thus connects the centres of legislation and commerce. The western section is represented by the Victoria Embankment, which is a mile and a quarter in length, and the roadway throughout which is 100 feet in width. The length of the eastern portion, from Blackfriars to the Mansion House, is about two-thirds of a mile, and the width of the road is 70 feet, except for about 80 yards between Trinity-lane and Cannon-street, heretofore known as New Earl-street, where at present the width is only 50 feet. The new thoroughfare was opened to the public in sections as its construction advanced and different portions of it became available for use; and the present ceremony must be regarded rather as the celebration of the completion of a great

undertaking than the mere opening of a street. In the course of the excavations which were necessary for the construction of the works, several memorials of antiquity were discovered. The most interesting example was found at the eastern end of the new street near the Mansion House, where, in the valley of the Walbrook, formerly a pure tributary of the Thames, but now a foul sewer, was uncovered a large slab of tessellated pavement, which it is supposed had been the floor of a Roman bath attached to a villa situated upon the banks of the stream. This relic was carefully removed, and presented by the Metropolitan Board of Works to the Corporation.

6. AGITATION FOR SHORTER WORKING HOURS.—A meeting of about 700 railway-guards, shunters, breaksmen, engine-drivers, and firemen connected with the London and North Western, Lancashire and Yorkshire, and Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire companies, was held in the Free Trade Hall, Manchester, for the purpose of agitating for shorter hours of labour and an advance of wages. The speakers all complained of the long hours during which they had to labour, and the small amount of remuneration received. A letter was read from Mr. Bass, M.P., expressing great interest in the movement, towards which he has contributed 100*l*. A resolution was unanimously passed recommending a day of ten hours, and overtime at the rate of eight hours a week, with a general advance of 2*s*. 6*d*. per week in the amount of wages.

9. LORD MAYOR'S DAY.—Alderman Gibbons, the newly-elected Lord Mayor, having been admitted into office with the customary formalities, the day of the procession or "show," proved unusually fine for the occasion. The Thames Embankment, which for the second time was selected as the route, was thronged from end to end. Its great width and the open spaces abutting upon it afforded ample room for spectators. Along the whole line the Lord Mayor was loudly cheered. On arriving at the Court of Exchequer his lordship was presented by the Deputy Recorder (Mr. Chambers), and congratulated by the Lord Chief Baron on his elevation to so high a civic distinction. The oaths were then administered, and the procession returned by the same route to Guildhall. A banquet took place at the Guildhall in the evening, at which several of her Majesty's ministers were present.

The Queen subsequently announced through Mr. Gladstone her intention to knight the retiring Lord Mayor, Alderman Dakin, in acknowledgment of his services during his mayoralty. The Court of Common Council on the 16th of November passed the following resolution on this subject, "That the best thanks of this Court are due and are presented to the Right Hon. Thomas Dakin, late Lord Mayor of this city, who has discharged the duties of the mayoralty with singular judgment and urbanity, maintained good order and freedom of debate in this Court, has been vigilant and judicious as a magistrate, a liberal patron of all accustomed charities, and who has been able to collect munificent funds mainly by his skilful organization and superintendence for the relief of a series of excep-

tional calamities endured in France through the war, and by the siege of Paris; in America by the conflagration in Chicago; in the West Indies by the hurricane which especially devastated Antigua; and in Persia by most severe famine. Lastly, he has maintained the historic reputation of the City of London by the brilliant hospitality which during the whole past year has graced the Mansion House. To all this may be added the distinguished mark of royal favour offered to him in the name of her Majesty by the Prime Minister, and the high honour conferred upon his lordship by the spontaneous testimony of the banking and mercantile community of London."

10. CASE OF LIBEL.—Mr. John Hampden, a gentleman who had rendered himself somewhat notorious by maintaining the theory of the flatness of the earth, was brought up before Mr. Flowers on a charge of libel. Some time previously he had challenged a gentleman named Wallace upon this question, and the matter was referred to arbitration upon each side depositing 500*l.*, according to a written agreement, which they signed. Mr. Walsh, the editor of the *Field*, the complainant in this case, was appointed referee, and the prize was placed in his hands, with instructions to give the whole sum of 1000*l.* to the one in whose favour he decided. Mr. Walsh decided against the defendant, and, according to the agreement, handed over the money to Mr. Wallace. Since then he had been the subject of the "grossest vituperation" at the hands of the defendant, who had sent numerous post-cards to persons advertising in the *Field*, warning them to place no faith in the integrity and honour of the complainant, who, he alleged, had aided and abetted Mr. Wallace in defrauding him of his money. Several witnesses were called, and stated that they received the post cards produced, alleged to have been sent to them by the defendant, and they immediately forwarded them to the editor of the *Field*. Mr. Flowers committed the defendant to the Old Bailey for trial, which took place on the 21st. Mr. Hampden pleaded guilty, and having made an ample apology, was discharged with consent of the prosecution.

11. ELECTIONS OF LORD RECTORS AT THE SCOTTISH UNIVERSITIES.—The Election at Edinburgh University took place this day, when Sir William Stirling Maxwell obtained a majority over Sir Roundell Palmer of 594 to 502 votes. At Glasgow, on the 16th, after a severe contest with Mr. Ruskin, Mr. Disraeli obtained a majority in all the four "nations," as they are termed; a very unusual circumstance. The votes were 610 to 476. At St. Andrew's, in the following week, Mr. Ruskin was elected by a majority of 81 against Lord Lytton's 79.

—POPULAR DEMONSTRATIONS IN IRELAND.—The acquittal of Kelly on his trial for the murder of the policeman Talbot was celebrated with great popular rejoicing at Cork, Limerick, Dundalk, Waterford, and other places in the Irish provinces. Bonfires blazed on the hills, bands paraded the streets, and the people exhibited the utmost joy. In Dundalk the band played Fenian tunes while

marching through the town. In Limerick, where a band was passing through Cecil-street, Mr. Kelly, a retired sub-inspector of constabulary, who was in his own parlour, was fired at. The bullet grazed his temple and lodged in the opposite wall. Mr. Kelly had been fifty years in the service, and had just retired on a pension. He had made himself obnoxious to the Fenian party in Limerick during the late risings, and had displayed considerable activity in tracking out conspirators.

13. MR. ALFRED WIGAN.—This eminent actor was entertained at dinner in the Douglas Hotel, Edinburgh, on the occasion of his approaching retirement from the stage, by a number of his friends and admirers. Lord Neaves acted as chairman, and the Solicitor-General of Scotland as croupier. Lord Neaves, in proposing “The health of Mr. Wigan,” remarked that that gentleman was an honourable member of an honourable profession. A demoralizing sentence had never issued from his lips, and he had never in his performances overstepped “the modesty of nature.” Sir Alexander Grant gave “The health of Mrs. Wigan;” and during the evening a humorous song, in reference to Mr. Wigan’s personation of Achille Dufard, was sung by Lord Neaves.

17. THE BISHOP OF LONDON’S PRIMARY VISITATION.—His lordship paid his first official visit to St. Paul’s on Monday, the 13th. The first four days of the week were devoted to services, and to the reception of clergy and other officials. On Friday, the 17th he delivered the primary charge to the clergy of his diocese. His lordship touched upon a variety of subjects, including the parochial system, the want of additional churches and clergy, pew-rents and free churches, the mode of dealing with the working classes, lay co-operation, sisterhoods, episcopal authority, ritualism, and the power of ecclesiastical courts. In dealing with the revision of the Prayer Book, and with the complaints made with respect to the violation of the rubric, the right rev. prelate asked for the co-operation of those who, sensitive, often to excess, of ritual in others, either from jealousy of it, or from carelessness, allowed themselves to neglect rubrics which had their use and obligation still. The Bishop counselled the surplice as the preaching vestment; and concluded his charge with an earnest appeal for unity amongst Christian bodies, so that they might work together for the common good.

—IRELAND.—At a meeting of the Statistical Society in Dublin, Mr. Justice Lawson delivered an address on the steadily growing prosperity of Ireland. He attributed the decrease in population partly to the use of machinery in agricultural operations, which diminished the number of labourers. Wages had increased fourfold. The deposits in savings’ and other banks had increased considerably within the last two years. The value of live stock had augmented in the year 1870 by 1,240,988*l*. Other branches of trade and industry showed also satisfactory figures. On the other hand, he considered that, though higher education was satisfactory, the intermediate education was the reverse; and that drunkenness

was decidedly on the increase, although the contrary might be said of crime in general. He was of opinion that there should be a more complete assimilation of laws in Ireland with those of England. In conclusion, he said, "Trade should be free; the transfer of land should be easy and simple; ignorance and crime should be treated as enemies to the commonwealth; reformation and prevention should be regarded, and will be found as well more effectual as more economical than punishment. These, with just laws firmly and impartially administered, constitute mainly what Government can do to promote the welfare of a people; and yet all these will prove insufficient to make us happy or contented, unless we are animated as a nation by the spirit of religion and the influence of brotherly love."

18. **EARLY SEVERE FROST.**—The frost set in with very unusual severity for this early period of the winter, and for a few days the ornamental waters in London were crowded with skaters. The frost yielded on the 23rd; but the temperature continued much below the average during the remainder of the month.

21. **LIQUOR TRAFFIC LAW.**—Several meetings were held about this time by supporters of the National Association for Promoting Amendment in the Law relating to Liquor Traffic. At one held at Adam-street, Adelphi, under the presidency of Sir Robert Anstruther, the following resolutions were adopted:—"Waiving all questions of abstract right to compensation on the part of licence-holders, it appears to this conference that the proposal which emanated from the brewers and publicans, that compensation should be provided from a licence-rental on houses which retain their licences, may be accepted as a safe basis for legislation." "That this conference is of opinion that it is expedient to introduce into any licensing law the principle of progressive limitation of the number of licensed houses with reference to population and area, and that, after such limit has been attained, the granting of new licences should be on the principle of public tender, as contemplated in both cases in Mr. Bruce's bill of the present year."

At a subsequent meeting in the same place, Archbishop Manning took part. At Exeter, on the 22nd, the Bishop presided at a similar meeting, and in the course of his speech observed, "that if they could not make men sober by Act of Parliament, they could, at all events, prevent others from making them drunk, and tempting them away from their virtue, under the authority of an Act of Parliament. He had no doubt whatever that the association must succeed, in the course of a very few years, in very seriously diminishing the present temptations to intemperance. Sunday closing," he said, "was one of the subordinate battles they had to fight in the general cause of sobriety and temperance; and all who cared any thing for the service of God knew how great was the value of Sunday to the whole Christian world. Those who watched human life, and saw what Sunday had done for it, would feel that whoever robbed the people of the Sunday, would indeed rob them of a priceless gift."

Mr. Thomas Hughes, M.P., at a meeting held in St. James' Hall for the same object, affirmed that there was no country in the world where there were such facilities for the obtaining of intoxicating liquors as in this country, and in no country was the traffic let alone as it was here.

23. ILLNESS OF THE PRINCE OF WALES.—The Prince of Wales was unable to fulfil an engagement to visit the Maharajah Dhuleep Singh, on account of a feverish attack, which soon assumed a grave aspect. A bulletin, signed by Drs. Jenner, Gull, Clayton, and Lowe, stated that the Prince was suffering from typhoid fever, but that there were no unfavourable symptoms.

24. RAILWAY ACCIDENTS.—An alarming accident occurred at Wigan to the train known as the "Flying Scotch Express." A train from Manchester was being arranged by the Wigan officials on the main line, when the Scotch Express, which was half an hour behind its time, came down the incline to the station at great speed. A dense fog prevailed, and the driver did not notice until too late that the station was blocked, so that a fearful collision took place, the Manchester train being driven 50 or 60 yards along the line. None of the passengers in the Scotch train were injured; but of those who were seated in the Manchester train seventeen were medically attended by local surgeons, who were quickly on the spot. Some of the passengers were very seriously hurt. The more alarm was created as it was known that the train conveying the Queen from Balmoral to Windsor was to pass the station in a few hours. The line was cleared in time for her Majesty's journey.

25. THE ROYAL FAMILY.—The Queen, accompanied by Prince Leopold and Princess Beatrice, arrived at Windsor, having left Balmoral the previous evening. It was announced that her Majesty's health was quite re-established. The accounts of the continued illness of the Prince of Wales from typhoid fever determined her Majesty to repair to Sandringham on the 29th. She left Windsor at 11.5 a.m., and was met at King's Lynn by the Duke of Edinburgh, who escorted her to Sandringham, where she arrived about 3.30. The Prince's three elder children, and those of Princess Louis of Hesse—who, with their mother, were at the time on a visit at Sandringham,—were despatched to Windsor. The Princess herself remained to share the watching and anxieties of the Princess of Wales. It was remembered by the nation how assiduous the Princess Alice had been exactly ten years before in her attentions to her lamented father, during his mortal illness from a fever of the same nature as that which now laid the Prince of Wales low; and public anxiety was perhaps enhanced by the recollection, in spite of the reassuring bulletins which were constantly published by the doctors in attendance, and eagerly secured by all classes throughout the country. It was popularly imagined that the disorder might have been contracted during the recent visit of their Royal Highnesses at Londesborough Lodge, near Scarborough,

as several of the party assembled there to meet them had been indisposed slightly; and the Earl of Chesterfield, who was among the number, was attacked by the fever in so severe a form that he sank from collapse, on the 1st of December. The medical attendant of Lord Londesborough's family stated, however, that the sanitary arrangements at Londesborough Lodge had been thoroughly examined before the Prince's visit, and were in perfect order. A groom in the establishment at Sandringham was also attacked with the fever.

— ELECTION RIOT AT DOVER.—There was great excitement at Dover on the occasion of the re-election of Mr. Jessel, Q.C., who had vacated his seat in consequence of taking the Solicitor-Generalship. At the conclusion of the poll, Mr. Jessel was found to have a majority of 88 votes over his competitor, Mr. Barnett, a Conservative. The numbers were 1231 to 1143. After the election, the mob of Mr. Barnett's supporters smashed the windows of some of the Liberal newspaper offices, and of the Dover Castle Hotel—where Mr. Jessel was staying,—and the Royal Hotel. The bands of the rival candidates came into collision at the corner of a street, and much damage was done to their instruments. Four or five of the ringleaders were taken into custody; and the riot subsided early on the following morning.

27. MURDER OF BISHOP PATTESON.—The melancholy intelligence of the death of this excellent and energetic missionary bishop reached England by telegraph. The accounts from Sydney, with the date of November 4, stated that both he and the Rev. Mr. Atkin had been massacred while landing on the island of Santa Cruz by a Melanesian native in revenge for kidnapping outrages by slavers. A short account of Bishop Patteson's life will be found among our obituary notices.

Another sad catastrophe among savages, which resulted in the death of Mr. Andrew Weguelin, was notified to England by telegraph on the 17th. He was killed by Indians while on a visit to the colony recently founded in the Grand Chaco, in South America. He was intercepted on his way to give alarm to a surveying-party of the approach of eleven armed Indians. A letter says, "Thus has been suddenly carried away one of the bravest and best-hearted fellows that ever landed in this country. He was one of the few whom to know was to esteem."

— TRADE DISPUTES.—The first general meeting of the newly-elected Trade Council was held at the George Inn, Blackheath, to receive the reports from various large works as to the progress of the nine hours' movement. The chair was taken by Mr. Barnes, who stated that the principles and objects of the Council were to unite working men of all trades, whether society or non-society men, socially, morally, and intellectually, for the advancement of their class. Delegates from several large firms attended, announcing that the men had determined to make a stand for the reduction of hours of labour, some of them asking advice and guidance of the

Council. It was announced at the close of the meeting that the Great Eastern Railway Company had conceded the nine hours to their *employés*.

30. THE SCOTTISH CORPORATION DINNER.—The Scottish festival, which takes place annually on St. Andrew's Day at the Freemasons' Tavern, was this year unusually well attended, from the circumstance of its being the first public opportunity in London of welcoming the Marquis of Lorne since his late marriage. There were between 400 and 500 Scottish noblemen and gentlemen at the tables, among whom were Sir Sidney Dacres, Lord Elcho, and Dr. Norman McLeod. The Marquis of Lorne presided. In proposing the health of the Prince of Wales, the Chairman said,—

“My lords and gentlemen, the next toast which I have to introduce to your notice is that of ‘The Prince of Wales and Duke of Rothsay, the Princess of Wales, and the other members of the Royal Family.’ I think I had better begin at once by telling you that which you will all be most anxious to hear—namely, about the health of the Prince of Wales. You will, I am sure, all be delighted to hear that the Prince has passed a quiet and favourable day. There cannot, of course, but be great anxiety produced by such an illness, but we have well-grounded hope that, with God's blessing, it will come to a favourable issue, seeing that his strength remains good, and that he has at length been able to take more rest. You all know that his Royal Highness is president of this corporation, and you must remember the courtesy, dignity, and kindness with which he presided at your festive meeting two years ago. I am sure you will mingle most fervent prayers with your cheers that the Princess of Wales may shortly see the Prince have a complete, speedy, and perfect recovery.”

The Marquis's speech was received with repeated cheers, and the toast was drunk with three times three.

Admiral Sir Sidney Dacres, in returning thanks for the Navy, said,—

“It is always with great pleasure that I return thanks for the service in which I have spent half a century. It is a toast which is always received with kindness and genial feeling, and God grant that that feeling may long exist. Nothing stirs the sailor or the soldier of our services so much as the knowledge that he is appreciated at home here in England. We live in a time of great change. (Hear, hear.) We have new ships, new guns, and new men. I do not mean to say that our men are all of the character of the seamen which made our navy famous in the history of the world. There is a great change in the *morale* of the seaman. He is now, for the most part, a discreet, prudent, thinking, and well-disposed person as compared with what he was even in my time; but that change has been effected by education. It is an important fact that we have now nearly 4000 boys being educated for the navy—a fact that must hereafter have its effect. But be that as it may, and in spite of the deprecatory remarks which we hear, proceeding chiefly from

grumblers (laughter), in spite of parties on either side of politics who wish to make political capital out of every little disaster, I believe that the navy is now in as good a position as it ever occupied in the history of England."

After the toast of the evening, "Prosperity to the Scottish Corporation," had been duly honoured, the Secretary read a long list of subscriptions, including one of 200 guineas from Sir Richard Wallace, which amounted at the close of the evening to between 4500*l.* and 4600*l.*

— OPENING OF THE DERBY MEMORIAL SCHOOLS.—These schools, attached to the district church of St. Peter, Great Windmill-street, which was built by the late Earl of Derby, have been erected as a memorial to him, and in furtherance of the work of education which he had been active in promoting. The opening ceremony was performed by Lord Francis Hervey. The incumbent, the Rev. Arthur Mozley, stated that the district consisted of nearly 6000 working men, chiefly artisans, tailors, shoemakers, and others—a far more respectable class than would be found in some other districts of East London. Dr. Stanley, Dean of Westminster, and the Rev. J. E. Kempe, Rector of St. James, Piccadilly, spoke on the occasion.

DECEMBER.

2. THE BROWN INSTITUTION.—A hospital of a novel character was opened to-day. About twenty years since, a Mr. Brown of Dublin left the residue of his estate in trust to the Senate of the London University to accumulate for a certain number of years, for the purpose of founding a hospital for the study and treatment of the diseases of quadrupeds and birds useful to men. The building erected for the purpose is situated near the Vauxhall station. Accommodation is provided for ten horses or bullocks, sheds or folds for twenty animals, such as sheep, kennels for dogs, hatches for smaller animals, besides hatches for poultry and an aviary for birds. The stalls, loose boxes, and kennels are all warmed by hot air, are paved with asphalt, and are fitted with every thing that can conduce to the comfort of their future occupants. The post of Professor Superintendent of the Institution has been conferred upon Dr. Burdon-Sanderson, the Professor of Physiology in University College, who is widely known for the good work he has done, and especially for his researches into the ultimate pathology of contagion.

— FIRE AT LEITH.—Between 800 and 900 yards of the West Pier, at Leith, was destroyed by fire. The pier, which was to a great extent of wood, was being covered with pitch, when the vessel con-

taining the liquid boiled over and set the pier in flames. Four or five fire-engines were got on board steamers, from which they were worked. The fire lasted all day. The communication with the docks was cut off, so that the shipping escaped. The pier was a favourite promenade.

— *LOSS OF A VESSEL.*—The fishing lugger "*Norfolk Hero*," of Yarmouth, was lost off the Norfolk coast, with a crew of eleven hands.

3. *FIRE AT WARWICK CASTLE.*—Early in the morning a fire burst out in the private apartments of Lady Warwick, situated in the east wing of the building. The Earl and Countess, and Lord Brook, were absent at the time. Some workmen had been engaged the day before in decorating these apartments. The steward's boy was the first to perceive the fire; he roused up two footmen. The alarm-bell was rung, and messages for aid were sent to the town, and to Leamington, Coventry, and Kenilworth. Engines and troops of firemen speedily arrived; but the whole of the east wing was consumed before they came. A few books from the library and some of the most valuable pictures were secured and carried into the courtyard. The castle stands upon an eminence, sloping down to the Avon. The front part was inaccessible to the firemen, from the great height of the burning apartments above the ground. They had, therefore, to play upon the building from the courtyard. For hours their efforts to check the flames appeared hopeless, and destruction seemed to threaten the whole structure. The grand staircase, with its richly-carved wood-work, conducted the fire to the grand hall, a magnificent apartment, 60 ft. by 40 ft. and 26 ft. in height. The Gothic wooden roof was richly and elaborately carved, in 1851, from designs by Mr. Poynter, of Westminster. The walls were panelled with carved oak, and hung with antlers of deer, armour, swords, and matchlocks. Here were exhibited Cromwell's battered helmet, and the doublet in which Lord Brooke was killed at the siege of Lichfield, in 1634. The grand hall and its contents are wholly destroyed. The blackened walls and the charred fragments and ashes of the gorgeous roof alone remain. So rapidly did the flames extend towards the state apartments, where were stored the most valuable pictures, tapestries, and other works of art, that preparations were made for the worst. The flames were already heaving the massive doors of the Red Drawing-room, which adjoins the Great Hall. The pictures by Rembrandt, Rubens, Vandervelde, Lely, Teniers, Murillo, and other famous masters, and the Vandyke portraits of Charles I., the Duke of Montrose, and Prince Rupert, were first removed into the courtyard. Then every thing else portable was removed, leaving only the furniture that was too large or too heavy to be carried away. The pictures were torn out of the headings on which many of them were inland in the walls; the tops of costly marble tables were taken off; the rich old tapestry in the state bed-room was wrenched off the walls; and Queen Anne's bed, presented to the Earl of Warwick by George III., was pulled down and carried away piecemeal.

One by one the Red Drawing-room, the Cedar Drawing-room, the Gilt Drawing-room, and the Boudoir, or State Dressing-room, were thus denuded. The flames up to six o'clock appeared to defy the exertions of the fire-brigade. Happily, their efforts at last got the mastery of the fire, and the west wing of the castle, with the state rooms, the chapel, the collections of sculpture, pictures, armour, and curiosities, was saved. The plate and jewels were also preserved; and the famous Warwick vase was in a greenhouse, out of harm's way. A footman named Everton did a brave act. He rushed into the gun-room as the flames approached and carried off upwards of 500 cartridges which had been stored there in anticipation of a shooting-party. He became seriously ill in consequence of his exertions.

4. SMITHFIELD CLUB CATTLE-SHOW.—In spite of the prevalent epidemic, the foot and mouth disease, which caused many of the beasts brought up for inspection to be ejected from the exhibition, this year's show was as a whole fully up to the usual standard. Cattle numbered 234 entries; sheep 145, and pigs 59 pens. The Devons and Herefords were both numerous and good classes, notwithstanding these two breeds suffered most by the rejection of the infected animals. In the class of young Devons, her Majesty received the first prize, Mr. Senior the second, and the Prince of Wales the third. In the older class Mr. W. Smith was first, in the oxen, Mr. Bond. In the cow-class, Mr. Davy's Actress came first. The class of Hereford oxen was commended by the judges. Mr. W. Heath was first. Her Majesty's heifer Victoria Alexandra was at the head of the heifer class, which was commended.

Mr. Stratton's white ox took the 100% plate as the best beast in the hall. Mr. Bruce's black-poll'd heifer took the cup for the best female.

Some useful Sussex cattle were exhibited; Mrs. Coote and Mr. Steere were first with oxen, and the Right Hon. H. Brand and Mr. T. Smith with cows and heifers. The Scotch polls had Mr. Bruce's fine black heifer at their head, and Mr. Postle was first in steers with one bred in Norfolk. The cross-bred and extra-stock cattle were numerous and good, an immense black-grey ox of Mr. W. Brown taking the 25% prize.

The 50% cup for the best pen of sheep falling to a lot of Lincolns caused some excitement among the breeders. They were a remarkably fine pen, weighing $8\frac{1}{4}$ cwt., and bred by Mr. J. Byron, from the Kirkham flock. Mr. Rigden took the 20% cup. The Leicesters were not numerous; but the late Lord Berners' were good specimens, and won two first prizes. Lord Chesham took two first prizes and the cup with Shropshires; and the Duke of Marlborough won with Oxfordshire Downs.

There was a good show of pigs, and a fine pen of small whites from Windsor were first in a large class; but among the blacks Mr. J. Biggs won the first prize and cup with three of immense size. The confined space in the galleries restricts the display of

implements; but the usual makers had stands, with but few novelties. The show of roots and cabbages was numerous, and some immense specimens might be seen.

— APPOINTMENT OF SIR ROBERT COLLIER.—The late Attorney-General took his seat for the first time as one of the members of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. His appointment as connected with his preliminary nomination to a judgeship in the Court of Common Pleas, which he only held for a day or two, as a necessary step to the higher office, was a subject of much discussion and blame in legal circles. The Act passed recently (34 and 35 Viet., cap. 91) declared “any persons appointed to act (on the Judicial Committee) under the provisions of this Act must be specially qualified as follows—that is to say, must, at the date of their appointment, be or have been judges of one of Her Majesty’s Superior Courts at Westminster,” &c.

The Lord Chief Justice, Sir A. Cockburn, addressed a letter of remonstrance to Mr. Gladstone, in which, after recording his emphatic protest against the course adopted, he maintained that the proviso in the Act was intended to secure the appointment of those who had gained *experience* as Judges of Superior Courts, and that no exception was made in favour of a law officer of the Crown. Mr. Gladstone in reply, having stated that he had referred Sir A. Cockburn’s letter to the Lord Chancellor, “as the transaction had been a joint one,” the Lord Chief Justice rejoined, “You assign as a reason for transmitting my letter to the Lord Chancellor, that the transaction is a joint one, and that the completed part of it to which I object was the act of the Lord Chancellor. I cannot allow an impression so wholly erroneous to remain without seeking to remove it. I have not objected, and could not object, to the appointment of Sir Robert Collier as a judge of the Common Pleas. If it had suited his views to accept a judgeship, I should have been the first to welcome his advent to the bench. My objection to the present appointment of Sir Robert Collier is not an objection to the appointment *in se*, but as being intended to create a factitious qualification for a seat on the Judicial Committee. It was because its ulterior object was to be your act that I took the liberty of addressing myself to you. Had I objected to the part of the transaction already completed, I should have addressed my observations to the Lord Chancellor.”

The Lord Chancellor wrote: “The appointment has been made with a full knowledge on my part of the intention of Mr. Gladstone to recommend him (Sir Robert Collier) for appointment as a member of the Judicial Committee under the Act. I have thus acted advisedly, and with the conviction that the arrangement was justified as regards both its fitness and its legality. I take upon myself the responsibility of thus concurring with Mr. Gladstone, and am prepared to vindicate the course pursued. You will not, I trust, think that I am wanting in respect if I reserve my explanation for a more suitable opportunity than could be afforded by a correspon-

dence with yourself, either directly or through the medium of Mr. Gladstone."

The Lord Chief Justice, in the letter to Lord Hatherley which closes the correspondence, after expressing the "mingled surprise and regret" with which he has received the information conveyed to him, said that his only object was to bring under the consideration of the Government the very serious objections to this appointment which presented themselves to his mind, to record his protest against what he honestly believed to be a violation of the spirit and intention of an Act of Parliament, and, therefore, a degradation of the judicial office. He concluded by declaring that he reserved to himself the right to make public the fact of his protest and the grounds on which it was founded.

8. STRIKES.—The agitation among various bodies of operatives, engineers, colliers, &c., continued to manifest itself throughout the country. On the 3rd of the month the servants of the railway companies which run their lines into London held a meeting at the Winchester Arms, Southwark, and set forth their grievances, especially their sufferings from the length of working hours, which in many cases it was averred amounted to fifteen hours a day, Sundays excepted. These men formed themselves into a society to be called "The Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants."

The strike that most affected the public convenience whilst it lasted was one among the telegraph clerks of the Manchester, Dublin, Edinburgh, Glasgow, and Belfast post-offices. An association had been formed some time before called the "Telegraphic Association for the Protection of Employés;" this coming to the knowledge of the Post-office authorities, they regarded it as a manifestation of disaffection, and punished nine clerks in the Manchester district who had joined it by suspension. Their refusal to reinstate these men led to the strike of the 8th. Mr. Scudamore, second secretary to the General Post-Office, offered to take back all who would express in writing their regret for their insubordination and return to their work on the 12th at noon. Some complied with the conditions, and those who failed to appear at the specified time were dismissed, but the majority of them were reinstated subsequently after expressing regret for their misconduct. At Dublin the men yielded after holding out four days.

— ILLNESS OF THE PRINCE OF WALES.—The typhoid fever with which the Prince was attacked last month, continued to run its usual course without any alarming complications during the first week in December; but on the 8th of the month, a very serious relapse occurred, and for some days the life of his Royal Highness was in imminent danger. Her Majesty, who had returned to Windsor from Sandringham, on the first of the month, having received an alarming telegram on the 8th, hurried thither again, accompanied by the Duke of Edinburgh and Princess Louise.

Prince Arthur arrived at midnight, and the other members of the Royal family on the following morning. Gloom was cast over

the whole nation, and the utmost sympathy was every where manifested for the Queen and the Princess of Wales, for the *Pall Mall Gazette* of the 9th wrote, "The excitement in London on the publication of the early editions of the evening papers yesterday afternoon was intense. Crowds of eager inquirers gathered round the various newspaper offices, as well as round the shops and stalls of the newsvendors, and earnest conversations were carried on. At Marlborough House the telegrams were watched for by large numbers of persons, who remained standing on the pavement, and out in the street, regardless of the piercing cold, and anxious only to learn the latest intelligence as speedily as possible. As might be expected the excitement here became very great on the arrival of a telegram, and in a few minutes after the messenger had brought in the intelligence the door was opened, the people were admitted, and copies were distributed to the fortunate individuals who were enabled to get near the office. Some one or other of the recipients would then read the document aloud to those who were waiting outside. Immediately on the receipt of one of these messages a copy was despatched to the head office of the metropolitan police in Scotland-yard, and the intelligence was instantly telegraphed to every police-station within the metropolitan district. At all these stations there were numbers of persons waiting during the day, many of whom came from considerable distances, especially in the rural districts. From the provincial towns we learn that equal anxiety was shown all over the country."

By desire of the Queen, the Archbishop of Canterbury issued the following forms of prayer, which were used on and after the 10th, in all churches and chapels of the Establishment.

"O Almighty God and merciful Father, to whom alone belong the issues of life and death, look down from Heaven, we humbly beseech Thee, with the eyes of mercy upon Albert Edward, Prince of Wales, now lying upon the bed of sickness. Thou Father of Mercies and God of all Comfort, our only Help in time of need, we fly unto Thee for succour on behalf of Thy servant. Grant, O Lord, that all the sins of his life past may be done away, and his soul washed in the precious blood of Christ, that it may be pure and without spot before Thee. If it shall be Thy pleasure, prolong, we beseech Thee, his days here on earth, and grant that he may live to Thee, and be an instrument of Thy glory, and a blessing to our Church and nation. Prepare him, O most loving Father, by Thy Holy Spirit, for all that lies before him, in life or in death; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

"Almighty and Everlasting God, who guidest the hearts of Kings; and who hast blest and sanctified the bonds of love to knit together the members of all Christian families, look down, we beseech Thee, on thy Servants Victoria, our Queen, and the Princess of Wales, in this day of their great trouble, and on all the Royal Family. Comfort and support them in their present trial, and grant that their hearts may be stayed only upon Thee: through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

Special forms were used in the Roman Catholic churches and by the Jews. Preachers very generally referred to the Prince's illness in their sermons. Canon Liddon at St. Paul's and Dean Stanley at Westminster Abbey did so at some length.

In India, Canada, and in all parts of her Majesty's dominions within telegraphic communication, the same anxiety was manifested, and prayers were offered up among the different religious denominations according to their several rites, including Greeks, Jews, Mahometans, and even the Parsee fire-worshippers in India. This suspense continued until the night of Wednesday, the 14th, when a slight turn for the better took place in the worst symptoms, and the invalid enjoyed the long-wished-for boon of refreshing sleep. From that time he gradually though slowly mended. On the 18th, one of the Prince's grooms, Charles Blegg, who had taken the same illness, and who for a time had been progressing favourably, died in consequence of a relapse. On the 19th the Queen returned to Windsor, and other members of the royal family likewise quitted Sandringham.

At the annual distribution of the Prince's Christmas gifts, on Saturday, the 23rd, the Princess of Wales, and the Prince and Princess Louis of Hesse were present. General Knollys addressed a few words to the recipients on behalf and by desire of the Prince. Referring to the causes which prevented his Royal Highness being present, as was his practice on these occasions, he said that the Prince returned thanks to the Almighty for his recovery, and he expressed the hope and trust common to all that his restoration to health might continue unimpeded in its progress. The Prince could have wished, had his strength permitted him, to leave his bed and come among them, and he trusted soon to be able to do so.

The last advices of the month from Sandringham reported that the Prince was recovering his health by slow but effective stages.

12. FATAL RAILWAY COLLISION.—A frightful accident took place near the Wortley Station, on the Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire Railway. A slow passenger-train had just entered a siding where was already a luggage-train, the driver mistaking the lights, when the driver of an express which was following, making a similar mistake, allowed his engine to dash into the break of the slow train, breaking it into fragments and severely injuring the guard. In the first carriage next the break were a man, his wife, and child. The woman was killed, and the child was much injured. Most of the passengers in both trains were very much shaken, and required the attendance of medical men, who were soon on the spot.

— A CENTENARIAN.—At Perranwell, Cornwall, a Mrs. Jenny Tiddy died at the age of one hundred years and nine months. The date of her baptism is beyond doubt. The old woman declared that she had never known a day's illness until the Saturday before her death.

14. FIRE AT ROTHERHITHE.—A fire of extraordinary magnitude

broke out at Rotherhithe in the granaries of Messrs. Bennett and Co., some of the largest storehouses of corn which exist in England. No less than 60,000 or 80,000 quarters of grain were said to be stored in the granaries, and the pecuniary loss was estimated by the lowest calculation at 150,000*l*. One hundred and eighty firemen were employed under the direction of Captain Shaw, and Messrs. Palmer and Hemlyn, in extinguishing the fire. The Salvage Corps also attended, and rendered conspicuous service.

20. LOSS OF THE "DELAWARE."—This large and valuable steamer, described as "one of the most magnificent vessels belonging to the port of Liverpool," which was on her way from Liverpool to Calcutta, was wrecked off the Scilly Isles during a terrific gale. It appears that about noon the gale was so violent that the ship was unable to make headway, although the engines were working with an average pressure of 14*lbs.* to 16*lbs.* of steam. The bearings became red-hot, and measures were taken to cool them, during which time the vessel drifted towards the rocks then in view. Being dangerously close on the rocky island of Mincarlo an effort was made to run her in between that island and the Seal Rocks. At this moment a tremendous sea broke on the decks, carrying away the captain and the bridge upon which he stood. The foremast was also swept away and the decks greatly injured. The vessel then rolled over to leeward, and, righting again, received another sea full on board. This drove the vessel again to leeward, and a third tremendous sea put her entirely out of sight. The spot where she went down was between Mincarlo and Seal Rocks, just outside the shoals known as the Fearing Ledges. The mate managed, on coming to the surface, to get into the damaged lifeboat, into which he drew the third officer. They were drifted on to White Island, where they were found in a very exhausted condition. These were the only two of the forty-nine on board who were saved. They stated that each of the twelve life-buoys belonging to the ship had a man in it when they drifted away, but they were powerless to render any assistance, so fearful was the gale. A third man was seen to land on the rocks, apparently in a state of complete exhaustion, and he was almost immediately washed into the sea again.

23. INSTALLATION OF THE CONSTABLE OF THE TOWER.—Field Marshal Sir George Pollock, G.C.B., G.C.S.I., was formally installed in this office. The day being foggy, the ceremony was performed by torchlight. On arriving at the Tower, Sir George was received by Lord Sydney and other officials, two detachments of troops being drawn up in front of the Governor's house, whilst the Yeomen Warders of the Tower were arranged as a guard of honour. The patents of appointment having been read by the light of two lanterns, Lord Sydney presented the keys to Sir George, saying, "In the name and on behalf of her Majesty I give into your custody, Field-Marshal Sir G. Pollock, the keys of the royal fortress and royal palace of the Tower of London." "God save the Queen," the Yeoman porter cried in a loud voice, and the semicircle of Yeomen

men warders responded "Amen." The troops then presented arms, the National Anthem was played by the band, the keys were handed over by Sir G. Pollock to the Fort Major, and the proceedings closed with the formal tender of possession by Lord Sydney to the new Constable of the Queen's or Governor's house.

25. DEATH OF MASTER MAGRATH.—Lord Lurgan's celebrated greyhound, which had three times won the Waterloo Cup, died rather suddenly at Brownlow House, Lurgan. A sort of inquest was held on his remains to ascertain whether he had met with foul play, the Rev. Dr. Haughton, Secretary to the Royal Zoological Society of Ireland, conducting the inquiry. It was satisfactorily proved that the dog's illness was a natural one, and that he had received the proper medical treatment.

— WINTER BATHING.—This morning the "All-the-year-round" bathers in the Serpentine, to the number of about thirty, assembled to take part in a swimming-match for a silver cup, which annually takes place on Christmas Day, after which they gathered round a bucket of rum and milk, and drank to the health of the Queen and the Prince of Wales.

26. BOXING DAY.—This being one of the four Bank holidays, under Sir John Lubbock's Act, was kept as a more general holiday than in former years. The weather was wretchedly wet, but at night, as usual, the theatres were crowded. The song of "God bless the Prince of Wales" was sung at most of them with enthusiastic applause, particularly at the East End theatres.

28. THE NEW FOREIGN CATTLE MARKET.—This morning a new market at Deptford, for the landing and slaughtering of foreign cattle, was formally opened in the presence of the Lord Mayor, Mr. Bontems, the chairman, and the members of the Markets Committee, and of a large number of the principal persons engaged in the metropolitan cattle-trade. This market will in future be the only place in the metropolis where foreign cattle will be allowed to be landed, and where the animals will be slaughtered prior to their sale and delivery to the wholesale butchers. Provision is made for the reception of several thousand animals at a time, and every precaution is to be taken for the prevention of contagion. The corporation paid 94,000*l.* for the land, and have since expended upwards of 100,000*l.* in the construction of the market. In return for this expenditure they will receive all the tolls and dues, and it is expected that in addition to wiping off a debt on the existing market in Copenhagen-fields, and paying all expenses, a considerable profit will be made.

30. FATAL BOILER EXPLOSION IN GLASGOW.—A "road steam-traveller," known as "Yuille's Traction Engine," while on its way to the shipbuilding yard of Messrs. John Elder and Company, Fairfield, stopped in Paisley-road, opposite an eating-house. A crowd of children and idlers had gathered round it, when suddenly the boiler burst, and the fragments of the engine were scattered among the crowd. Three boys, aged fifteen, eleven, and nine years, were killed. A little girl six years of age, and a boy about fourteen, died since in

the hospital. About forty other persons, chiefly children, were seriously injured. The boiler itself shot into the air, and fell through the roof of the eating-house, but though there were three persons on the premises, none of them were seriously injured. The engine was employed by Elder and Co., the Clyde shipbuilders, to drag heavy machinery between Govan and Glasgow.

OBITUARY

OF

EMINENT PERSONS DECEASED IN 1871.

January.

DEAN ALFORD.

THE Very Rev. Henry Alford, D.D., Dean of Canterbury, critic, poet, and divine, was born in London, in 1810, the son of respectable parents. His early education he received at Ilminster Grammar School, and its completion at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he gained a scholarship and took his B.A. and M.A. degrees. In 1834 he was elected a Fellow of his college, and in the following year appointed Vicar of Wymeswold, Leicestershire. In 1841 he preached the Hulsean Lectures at Cambridge, and became Examiner of Logic and Moral Philosophy in the University of London. In 1853 he was appointed Incumbent of Quebec-street Chapel, where he gained high reputation by his eloquent preaching, and in 1857 was recommended by Lord Palmerston for the Deanery of Canterbury. Dean Alford's literary efforts date from the time of his University career. In 1831 he published at Cambridge his first volume, "Poems, and Poetical Fragments;" in 1835, "The School of the Heart, and other Poems," in two volumes; and, in 1841, "Chapters on the Poets of Greece." In 1841 he also produced the first part of a very important and highly-esteemed work—his edition of the Greek Testament, the compilation of which occupied him nearly twenty years. Of late years he contributed articles on religious and literary topics to the *Contemporary Review*, *Good Words*, and other periodicals, and took part in contro-

versies with respect to various points in English grammar. The Dean's little book on New Testament synonyms is a collection of gems of infinite value to the Christian student. He died at Canterbury on the 12th of January, after a brief illness.

PAUL BEDFORD.

The facts of the career of this old "Adelphi favourite" are few and of no remarkable interest. Born in Bath about 1798, he appears to have taken early to the dramatic profession, and to have served his novitiate upon the stage of his native town. Thence he proceeded to other provincial theatres. It was on November 2, 1824, that his name first figured on a London play-bill. On that night he came out at Drury Lane as Hawthorn in "Love in a Village," Mrs. Bedford appearing as Rosetta. Even Genese, the most indefatigable of theatrical chroniclers, does not deem either husband or wife worthy of more notice than the simple remark that they both came from Dublin and played the parts in question. From the Lane, Paul Bedford passed shortly afterwards to the Garden, where his good voice did fair, though not brilliant, service in the operatic parts, more especially as Caspar in "Der Freischütz." In 1839 he was a member of the Adelphi company, and in the month of October of that year he achieved the greatest success of his life by his performance of Blueskin in Mr. Buckstone's clever adaptation of Mr. Harrison Ainsworth's famous novel of "Jack Sheppard." With this one character, in which the song of "Jolly

Nose" afforded a favourable opportunity for the display of his vocal abilities Paul's fame became thoroughly identified, and upon the stage he was Blueskin ever afterwards. For many a long year he was a prominent member of Mr. Webster's company, "hunting in couples," to use a sporting phrase, first with Mr. Wright, and more recently with Mr. J. L. Toole, to whose faithful friendship he was largely indebted. On his departure from the Adelphi he had to take refuge in the "Hall by the Sea" and other kindred places of musical entertainment, where he sung his once comical songs with very tragic effect. He died in London on the 11th.

REV. HENRY CASWALL.

This divine, Vicar of Figheldean, Wilts, was a man whose career ran somewhat out of the beaten track of country clergymen's existence. The son of an English clergyman, the Rev. R. C. Caswall, he was born at Yateley, Hampshire, in 1810, and after having received his early education at a grammar school in Essex, he took his degrees of B.A. and M.A. at Kenyon College, Ohio, in the United States. Having been ordained on the other side of the Atlantic, he was for some years engaged as a parochial clergyman and also as a professor of theology in the land of his adoption and in Canada: and on returning to England in 1842 he found that in order to hold a parochial cure or preferment in the land of his birth, it was necessary to obtain the passing of a special Act of Parliament in his favour. Nothing daunted, he set about the work; obtained a private Act, removing the disabilities attaching to his ordination in the States, and not very long afterwards was nominated by the late Bishop (Denison) to the vicarage of Figheldean. Subsequently he was made a prebendary of Salisbury, and elected proctor in Convocation for the diocese. In 1854 he received the honorary degree of M.A. from the University of Oxford, and that of D.D. from Trinity College, Hartford, Connecticut, United States. Mr. Caswall's name is well known as the author of works on "America and the American Church," the "City of the Mormons," the "Prophet of the Nineteenth Century," the "Jerusalem Chamber," a "Pilgrimage to Canterbury," "Scotland and the Scottish Church," "The Western World Revisited," "The Martyr of the Pongas," "The American Church and the American Union," and other publications, all more or less of a religious character.

COLONEL SIR PROBY THOMAS CAUTLEY, K.C.B.

Sir Proby Cautley was distinguished in more departments than one. He was employed in the field in 1820 and 1821 in reducing numerous forts in Oude. In 1825-26 he served at the siege of Bhurtpore, and was afterwards employed as a civil engineer on the Eastern Jumma Canal in the North-Western Provinces of India. Subsequently he was the projector and designer of the Ganges Canal Works, which were opened in April 1854. On his return to England he was made a K.C.B., and in 1858 he was selected to fill one of the new seats in the Indian Council, which he held till 1868, when he retired into private life after a service of 50 years. To geological and palaeontological science he rendered valuable services during a long residence by the Sewalik Hills. Colonel Cautley's contributions to the proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal and to the Geological Society of London, including some which were the joint productions of himself and his intimate friend and fellow-labourer, the late Hugh Falconer, extend from 1826 over a period of more than 20 years. The Geological Society in 1837 awarded their Woollaston gold medal in duplicate to these brothers in Sewalik discoveries.

SIR WILLIAM DENISON.

Sir W. Denison was brother of the Speaker of the House of Commons and of the late Bishop of Salisbury. He was a man of remarkable energy, and in addition to his military scientific learning, having belonged to the Royal Engineers, he possessed great administrative abilities. He had occupied many high appointments in the colonies. He was appointed lieutenant-governor of Van Dieman's Land in June 1846, when he received the distinction of knighthood. He was subsequently governor-general of New South Wales, and was governor of Madras from November 1860 to March 1866, and was temporarily governor-general of India from the death of the Earl of Elgin to the arrival of Sir John Lawrence in January 1864. He was the third son of the late Mr. John Denison, M.P., of Ossington Hall, Notts. He was married to a daughter of Admiral Sir William Phipps Hornby, K.C.B. He entered the army in 1826, and became a colonel in the Royal Engineers on September 20, 1860. Sir William Denison was created a Knight Commander of the Bath (of the Civil Division) in 1856.

SIR HENRY DURAND.

In Major-General Sir Henry Marion Durand, K.C.S.I., C.B., Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab, who was killed by a fall from an elephant as he was entering the frontier principality of Tonk, in India, on the 1st of January, India lost one of the ablest of her trained statesmen, one of the bravest of her soldiers, and one of the most energetic of her administrators. He was born in 1812, and received his education at Addiscombe, where his high attainments procured him a commission as second lieutenant in the Bengal Engineers, the highest military branch in the East India Company's service, in June 1828. He became lieutenant April 20, 1835, and accompanied the army under General Sir John Keane during the Afghanistan campaign in 1839, and at the commencement of the campaign showed a military spirit of future eminence. He was present at Sir John Keane's capture of Ghuznee, where the commander-in-chief first encountered Prince Hyder, son of Dost Mahomed, who, with a garrison of 3500 Afghans, defended the fortress and citadel, which were of formidable strength, and able to sustain a prolonged defence. When before the enemy it was found that the siege train was left at Candahar. To quote General St. Vincent Eyre's "Retrospect of the Afghan War," &c., recently circulated,—"At this crisis an officer of Bengal Engineers came to the rescue with the happy proposal to blow open the only accessible gate with gunpowder. This was successfully accomplished, in the partial obscurity of early dawn, by a party of sappers, headed by Lieutenant Durand, of the Bengal Engineers, who volunteered for the duty, and who is believed to have originated the idea." His subsequent services with the army in India had extended over several of the most brilliant campaigns, and during the terrible mutiny. He served in the Gwalior campaign of 1843-44, and was present at the battle of Maharajpore. He served in the Punjab campaign of 1845-6, including the battles of Chillianwallah and Gojjerat, for which he was made brevet major. Soon after he was transferred to the Indian Civil Service, and just before the mutiny broke out was appointed political agent at Indore. At that crisis, by his active exertions, he drove back Tantia Topee, and saved Southern India. When the rebellion was quelled, Durand returned to England, and sat for three years at the council of the Secretary of State for India. Returning to the East, he became Foreign Secretary at Calcutta, and afterwards Military

Member of the Governor-General's Council. It was reserved, however, for the sound judgment of the Earl of Mayo to do full justice to Sir Henry Durand, and to appoint him to an office second in importance only to his own—the government of the Punjab. Durand's commissions bear date as follow:—Second Lieutenant, 1828; Lieutenant, 1835; Captain, 1844; Brevet Major, 1849; Brevet Lieutenant-Colonel, 1854; Lieutenant-Colonel, 1858; Colonel, 1861; Major-General, 1867. He received the decoration of C.B. 1858, and of K.C.S.I. 1867. Sir Henry married, first, 1843, Mary, daughter of Mr. John McCaskell, and, secondly, 1859, Emily Augusta, widow of the Rev. Henry S. Polehampton (the well-known chaplain at Lucknow during the mutiny). He had received the bronze star for Maharajpore, and medal with two clasps for Chillianwallah and Gojjerat, and also a medal for his services in Central India; and the Duke of Argyll, in his despatch to the Governor-General, while expressing his deep regret at the lamentable occurrence, adds, "the life of such a man is an example to the service."

THE DUCHESS DE FRIAS.

This lady, born Victoria Balfe, second daughter of Michael Balfe, the composer, died at Madrid, on January 22, from the effects of nervous rheumatic fever. The duchess, who made her *début* at the Royal Italian Opera in London, in 1857, and sang with great success in that and the two following seasons, was originally married to Sir John Crampton, from whom she was divorced in 1863.

SIR GEORGE HAYTER.

Sir George Hayter, K.S.L., died at his residence in the Marylebone-road, on January 18, at the age of seventy-eight. He was the son of Mr. Charles Hayter, professor of perspective to her Royal Highness the Princess Charlotte of Wales. During his early professional studies at the Royal Academy he gained two medals and other distinctions, and in 1815 was appointed painter of miniatures and portraits to the Princess Charlotte of Wales and her husband the Prince Leopold (the late King of the Belgians). He diligently studied at Rome for three years, and then took up his residence in London as historical and portrait painter, in which branch of art he obtained the highest rank, having gained the position of principal painter in ordinary and portrait painter to the Queen. The late Sir George Hayter was made member of the Academy

of St. Luke, in Rome, in 1818; member of the Imperial Academy of Parma, in 1826, member of the Academies of Bologna, Florence, and Venice, in 1828; Knight of the Lion and Sun of Persia, in 1829, &c. He was author of several works on art, among others of the appendix to the "*Hortus Ericæus Woburnensis*," on the classification of colours, with a nomenclature. Sir George Hayter was thrice married.

DR. MAYO.

The death of Thomas Mayo, M.D., F.R.S., formerly president of the College of Physicians, and a distinguished writer on medical subjects, occurred at Corsham on January 13. He was born in London in 1790, being a son of the late John Mayo, M.D., and after receiving a preliminary education in Westminster School, proceeded to Oxford, where he became a Fellow of Oriel College, and took the degree of M.D. in 1818. In the following year he was elected a Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians of London, and in 1856 he was made president of that institution. Dr. Mayo acted for many years as physician to the Marylebone Infirmary. His principal works are "*Elements of the Pathology of the Mind*," 1838; "*Clinical Facts and Reflections*," 1847; "*Outlines of Medical Proof Revised*," 1850; and a treatise "*On Medical Testimony and Evidence in Cases of Lunacy, with Essays on Soundness of Mind*," 1854.

ALEXANDER MUNRO.

The young sculptor Munro, who died at Cannes on the 1st instant, had long been in such bad health, that his recovery was generally regarded as hopeless by his many and attached friends. He had no rival in the graceful and fanciful treatment of children. His portrait busts of women were distinguished for their refined and delicate sentiment. Above all, he was pre-eminently successful in his portraits in high and low relief—perhaps the most difficult style in the range of sculpture. But though his special power lay in the range of the delicate and graceful, and found the most palpable and readiest expression in the portraiture or idealization of children and women, it would be very unfair to forget Mr. Munro's many contributions to sculpture of a graver and manlier kind. His statues of Hippocrates, Galileo, Davy, and James Watt in the Oxford Museum are remarkable for picturesqueness, concentration, and character, though the scale of the figures rendered necessary by the conditions of the

building is unfavourable to effect. His finest work of a monumental kind—and a very grave, dignified, and impressive work it is—is his colossal standing statue of James Watt, at Birmingham, a work of art in every way worthy of the subject, and deserving to rank with Chantrey's famous monumental figure. After the James Watt, Mr. Munro's two most important public statues are the Queen Mary, now in Westminster Hall, in which the difficulties of a costume singularly ill adapted to sculpture are boldly and successfully encountered, and a graceful fountain nymph in marble, erected by the late Marquis of Lansdowne, in Berkeley-square.

LORD FREDERICK PAULET.

Major-General Lord Frederick Paulet, C.B., officer of the Legion of Honour, and Knight of the Medjidie, Colonel of the 32nd Foot, Equerry and Comptroller of the Household of H.R.H. the Duchess of Cambridge, died on the 1st inst. at his residence at the Albany. His lordship had just undergone a surgical operation, and was considered to be going on most favourably. Lord Frederick was the youngest of the eight children of Charles Ingoldsby, thirteenth Marquis of Winchester, by his wife Anne, second daughter of the late Mr. John Andrews, of Shotney Hall, Northumberland, and was born May 12, 1810, consequently was aged sixty years. He entered the army as lieutenant in the Coldstream Guards in June 1826, and served with that distinguished corps in the Eastern campaign of 1854, and up to May 26, 1855, and was with his regiment at the battles of Alma, Balaklava, and Inkerman, and during the siege of Sebastopol. He had recently served on the Staff in North America, having commanded the Brigade of Guards sent to that country in 1861.

JOHN ABEL SMITH.

John Abel Smith, Esq., M.A., J.P., late M.P. for Chichester, died on the 7th inst., at Kippington, near Sevenoaks, Kent. The lamented gentleman, distinguished alike for the benevolence of his nature and the liberality of his political principles, was the head of the great banking firm of Smith, Payne, and Co. He was born in 1801, the eldest son of John Smith, Esq., of Blendon Hall, Kent, a banker in London, and M.P. for Bucks. He was educated at Christ College, Cambridge, where he graduated in 1824. In 1830 he entered the House of Commons as member for Midhurst, and sat subse-

quently for Chichester, from 1831 to 1859, and again from 1863 to 1868. A staunch and consistent Liberal, he took an eager part in the great Reform legislation of 1832, and was one of the chief advocates for the admission of Jews into Parliament.

SIR WILLIAM VERNER, BART.

The above-named venerable and gallant baronet died on January 20. He was the younger of the five sons of Mr. James Verner, of Church Hill, county Armagh, by Jane, daughter of the Rev. Henry Clarke, of Anasummary, county Armagh, and was born October 25, 1782. For many years his father sat in the Irish Parliament for the county of Armagh. The late baronet married, October 19, 1819, Harriet, only child of the late Colonel Hon. Edward Wingfield, son of Richard, third Viscount Powerscourt, by whom he had surviving issue two sons and several daughters. Early in life he served with the 7th Hussars in Spain and Portugal. He was with his regiment under General Sir John Moore during the memorable retreat to Corunna, and served under the Duke of Wellington up to the close of the war, having been present at the battles of Orthes, the Pyrenees, and Toulouse. He served also with the 7th Light Dragoons, under Lieut.-Colonel Sir Edward Kerrison, during the campaign of Waterloo, as senior captain of the regiment, and was severely wounded in the head and slightly in the arm at Waterloo, the first from a musket-shot, the latter from the sabre of a cuirassier. He obtained his promotion as major for distinguished gallantry on the field of battle. He obtained the rank of lieutenant-colonel in the army in 1826, when he retired from the service. He was elected member of the House of Commons for the county of Armagh after the passing of the first Reform Bill in 1832, and uninterruptedly represented the county up to the last general election, when he declined coming forward owing to the infirmities attendant upon his advanced years. He was a Conservative in politics, was deputy grand-master of the Orange association, and had always taken a prominent part in the defence of Protestantism in Ireland. Owing to his zealous political feeling he was struck off the commission of the peace by Lord Normanby, for giving at a public dinner the toast, "The Battle of the Diamond," but was subsequently restored. Colonel Verner, during the lord-lieutenancy of the Duke of Richmond, served as aide-de-camp to his Excellency. In recognition of his constant adherence to

the Conservative party he was created a baronet of the United Kingdom in July 1846. In 1860 he received permission to accept and wear the Hanoverian Order, which was conferred for distinguished services with the German Legion during the Peninsular war.

February.

MR. A. APPLGATH.

Mr. Augustus Applegath, who died on the 14th of this month, was known as the originator of some important improvements in the art of printing. He was the inventor of the composition-ball and composition-roller, and afterwards of the steam printing-press. For his invention of bank-notes that could not be forged he received from the Bank authorities the sum of 18,000*l*. He also invented a machine for printing six colours at once. The patent for the steam-press was in the joint names of Cowper and Applegath. The first book printed by steam was "Waterton's Wondercap." Mr. Applegath subsequently established great silk and print works at Crayford and Dartford.

GENERAL ROBERT DOUGLAS, C.B.

General Douglas died at Claygate, near Esher, on February 10, aged ninety-three. He was the eldest son of General Douglas, R.A., commandant at Woolwich. The deceased entered the Royal Regiment of Artillery, as second lieutenant, November 1, 1796, and became lieutenant September 1, 1798. He served at the capture of the Danish and Swedish West India Islands in 1801, and in the expedition to the north of Germany of 1805-6. He served also in the Peninsular campaign from February 1812 to March 1814. He was rewarded with the gold cross for his services at Salamanca, Vittoria, Pyrenees, and Nivelle, having commanded a field-battery, and the silver war-medal with one clasp for San Sebastian.

MRS. NATHANIEL HAWTHORNE.

After a brief illness, this accomplished lady died at her residence in Shaftesbury Street, Kensington, on Sunday morning, February 26. After the loss of her distinguished husband she came to Europe, and with her family resided for some time in Dresden. There she prepared for the press her very interesting notes of travel, and notices of several of the picture gal-

leries of Europe, and subsequently the interesting and characteristic "English Note-book" of her husband, recently published. During her short stay in England last summer, to see the last-named work through the press, she resolved to take up permanently her residence in England, remembering her husband's declaration that, "notwithstanding its mists and fogs and many drawbacks, the climate of England was the best in the world." Scarcely, however, had she fixed upon a locality where many old friends resided, taken a house, and gathered into it the favourite books of her husband—works of art dear to herself, from her old home of the Wayside, in Concord, Massachusetts, United States—than she caught a cold, which slowly ripened into a disease of a pleuritic character, from which she had suffered some years ago, and of which she died.

CANON MELVILL.

The Rev. Henry Melvill, Canon of St. Paul's, and Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen, died, on the 9th inst., at the Residential House, Amen Corner. He was born, Sept. 14, 1798, the son of Captain Philip Melvill, of the 73rd Regiment, Lieutenant-Governor of Pendennis Castle, Cornwall. Educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, he graduated in 1822 as Second Wrangler and First Smith's prizeman. Immediately after he accepted a Fellowship at Peter House, and acted as one of the public examiners, as a Proctor, an examiner in Hebrew, and a Select Preacher before the University. In about ten years after he married, vacated his Fellowship, and became Incumbent of Camden Chapel, Camberwell. Mr. Melvill's next appointment was that of Principal of the East India College at Haileybury, which he retained until the dissolution of the institution. In 1840, Mr. Melvill was selected for the Chaplaincy of the Tower of London, and while holding that preferment was elected to the Golden Lectureship in St. Margaret's, Lothbury. In 1856 he was made a Canon of St. Paul's, and in 1863 was nominated by the Dean and Chapter to the Rectory of Barnes. An eloquent and popular preacher and the author of a very large number of printed sermons, this eminent scholar and divine was held in high estimation. Of Canon Melvill's brothers, one was the late Sir James Cosmo Melvill, K.C.B., and another the present Major-General Sir Peter Melvill, K.C.B.

T. W. ROBERTSON.

Few dramatists of modern times have risen so rapidly into celebrity as Mr. Robertson, and it is worthy of note that all his best plays were successfully addressed to the most refined class of playgoers. The piece which first brought him into general notice, "David Garrick," was a mere translation from the French piece, "Sullivan," and chiefly owed its popularity to the excellent acting of Mr. Sothorn. But the comedies with which Mr. Robertson's name is most intimately associated, and in connexion with which it will be remembered, are those which were brought out by Miss Mame Wilton at the Prince of Wales's Theatre. At the Prince of Wales's he had the advantage of a company, the members of which perfectly knew how to work together, and could accurately realize his creations. In "sensational" drama, whenever he attempted it, he more or less failed; but as a writer of comedies of the kind to which we have referred he was unrivalled. By his decease he leaves a gap in an important department of dramatic art. Mr. Robertson may be said, in his own bright words, to have been "nursed on rose-pink, and cradled in properties." His father was an actor, his mother an actress, and his sister Madge one of the first artists in London. Mr. Robertson, sen., being the manager of an important theatrical "circuit," young Tom Robertson himself naturally turned actor. But he was not a good actor, he owned this over and over again. During the intervals of acting, and during his peregrinations from town to town, he tried his hand at play-writing, but his plays were always refused. He managed to get a farce called "The Cantab" produced at the Strand in 1861, but his first original production was a drama, called "A Night's Adventure," at the Olympic, when under Mr. Farren's management in 1851. Throughout this tiresome acting-life in the provinces, Mr. Robertson was not idle. He slaved at translating many plays for a publisher, which were acted from time to time at the east end of London. Tired of the stage, and of wandering from one garrison town to another, Mr. Robertson came up to London in 1860, and determined to earn his bread by light literature. His clever and charming style soon found a market. He tried his hand at journalism of all kinds, and it will no doubt be read with some little surprise that the brilliant author of "Caste" was ten years ago editing a mining journal, to whose pages he contributed a novel, which was subsequently dramatized by him, and

called "Shadow Tree Shaft." He wrote for the best light periodicals of that time; he was dramatic critic to the *Illustrated Times*, to which newspaper he also contributed some admirable dramatic sketches, he threw in his fortunes with those of a little band of struggling authors like himself, and together each Christmas they produced a nosegay of novelties. The plots of most of Mr. Robertson's Prince of Wales's plays will be found in these little Christmas volumes. Undaunted by this never-ending periodical and newspaper writing, Mr. Robertson still wrote plays, and they were constantly rejected. "Society," the play which made Mr. Robertson, was in the Haymarket for many months, and was eventually sent back, to the bitter disappointment of the author. At last, in 1864, Mr. Sothorn listened to Mr. Robertson, and "David Garrick"—an adaptation of a French piece called "Sullivan"—was bought, paid for, and produced. In the year 1865 the Prince of Wales's Theatre was opened by Mr. Byron and Miss Marie Wilton, when "Society" was produced, and Mr. Robertson's name was made. There was something so fresh and charming in the style, such an utter absence of conventionality about the whole thing, the artists—most of them new to London—were so clever and the play so bright, that the Prince of Wales's Theatre and Mr. Robertson became the talk of the town. Thus having got his foot on the ladder at this little theatre, up went Mr. Robertson. He knew exactly the strength and the cleverness of his company, and he fitted it to a nicety. "Society" was followed by "Ours" in 1866, "Caste" in 1867, "Play" in 1868, "School" in 1869, and "M.P." in 1870. At other theatres Mr. Robertson was naturally sought after. He gave "Home" to the Haymarket, "Dreams" to the Gaiety, "For Love" to the Holborn, "Shadow Tree Shaft" to the Princess's, "A Rapid Thaw" and "War" (his last) to the St. James's; and he has written several plays, such as "Birth" and "The Passion Flowers," which were only acted in the provinces. Mr. Robertson also wrote the libretto to an opera by Mr. F. Clay, called "Constance," which was produced at Covent Garden, and an entertainment for the German Reeds, called "A Dream of Venice." He died after a wearing and painful illness, at his residence in Haverstock Hill, at little more than forty years of age, just when after the many cruel struggles of his life he had gained a secure position.

DR. SYMONDS.

This eminent physician died at Bristol on Saturday, February 25, in his 64th year. Almost his last public appearance was as president of one of the sections at the autumnal meetings in 1869 of the Social Science Congress in Bristol. He was one of the original medical staff of the General Hospital in that city, which was opened in 1832, just as he settled there; and he was the author of many valuable works. The professional career of Dr. Symonds was perhaps as successful and eminent as that of any physician in England out of London; and whilst his intellectual qualities were so high, there were few men of more amiable or benevolent disposition, or more courteous and considerate. He was a native of Oxford, where his father was a surgeon.

March.

THE QUEEN OF SWEDEN.

Wilhelmina Frederica Alexandrina Anne Louise, Queen Consort of Charles XV., King of Sweden and Norway, died on the 30th March. Her Majesty, a Princess of Orange, was born at the Hague, Aug. 5, 1828, the eldest daughter of Prince William Frederick Charles, Admiral of the Dutch Fleet (brother of the late King of Holland), by his wife, Princess Louise, sister of the present Emperor-King of Germany. She married, June 19, 1850, Charles, Crown Prince of Sweden, who succeeded his father as King, July 8, 1859; and was, with his Queen, crowned at Stockholm, May 3, 1860. The issue of the marriage is one child, Louise Josephine Eugénie, born Oct. 31, 1851; married, July 31, 1869, to the Crown Prince of Denmark. The King of Sweden is son of the late Oscar I. by Josephine de Beauharnais, his wife, and grandson of the French General Bernadotte, who ascended the throne of Sweden.

ROBERT AND DAVID CHAMBERS.

Mr. Robert Chambers, LL.D., of the firm of Messrs. William and Robert Chambers, publishers, Edinburgh and London, died at St. Andrew's on the 17th in the 69th year of his age. He was the author of a number of works, including the "Traditions of Edinburgh, Popular Rhymes of Scotland, Histories of the Rebellions in Scotland," the "Domestic Annals of Scotland," &c. Since 1832 he and his brother, Mr. William Chambers,

have published numerous works intended for popular instruction, such as *Papers for the People*, *Miscellaneous* of useful and entertaining Tracts, *Chambers' Information for the People*, and *Chambers' Encyclopædia*. Three days later his younger brother, Mr. David Chambers, died in London from the effects produced upon him by the intelligence of his brother's death.

PROFESSOR DE MORGAN.

Professor De Morgan—the great mathematician and teacher whose books changed and raised the whole character of mathematical study in England—died on the 18th, and was buried at Kensal Green. His health had been shaken not many years ago by the loss of a son, a very able and promising young man, who was said to inherit not a little of his father's great mathematical capacity, but the proximate cause of his death was nervous prostration. His life had been one of extraordinary labour and great achievement. His numerous mathematical, astronomical, literary, and biographical articles in the *Penny Cyclopædia* made up nearly one-sixth of that enormous work (itself twenty-seven folio volumes). Besides these, his two treatises (mathematical and popular) on Probabilities, his Differential and Integral Calculus, his Arithmetic, Algebra, Trigonometry, and Treatise on Double Algebra were more than sufficient achievements even for the lifetime of an industrious man of genius. And over and above all these undertakings, his miscellaneous essays contributed to various newspapers and reviews were enough to have occupied the leisure of an ordinary man. Yet he died in his sixty-fifth year, and after gaining as much of the hearty affection of his contemporaries as usually falls to the lot of far less busy and less preoccupied men. He was born at Madura, in Southern India, June 27, 1806, the son of Colonel De Morgan, of the Madras Army. He entered Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1824, and took his Bachelor's degree as Fourth Wrangler in 1827. Originally destined for the Bar, he became a student of Lincoln's Inn, but abandoned all thought of the legal profession on his election, in 1823, to the Professorship of Mathematics in the University of London—a position resigned in 1831, but resumed in 1836. For many years he practised as an actuary. Professor de Morgan contributed largely to the "*Penny Cyclopædia*," "*British Worthies*," the "*Companion to the Almanac*," and the publications of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, as

well as to *Notes and Queries* and the *Athenæum*. He was a Fellow of the Royal Astronomical Society and of the Cambridge Philosophical Society.

SIR CHARLES SHAW.

Sir Charles Shaw, K.T.S., &c, died at Homburg, in the 77th year of his age. Sir Charles was of Scottish extraction, being the third son of the late Mr Charles Shaw, of Ayr, North Britain, and was born in the early part of the year 1795. He entered the 52nd Regiment of Foot at the age of eighteen, and, having served through the campaigns in Holland and Belgium, in 1813 and 1814, was present with his regiment at Waterloo. In 1817 he was appointed to the 90th Regiment. In 1831 he joined the liberating army of Portugal in the Azores, in command of the Marines belonging to the fleet of Admiral (now Sir George) Sartorius, and commanded a regiment throughout the civil war in Portugal. He was in every action and sortie during the siege of Oporto, in the course of which he was several times wounded. For his services in command of a brigade in repulsing the Miguelite army he was created a Knight Commander of the Portuguese Order of the Tower and Sword, and shortly afterwards was presented with a colonel's commission in the Portuguese army. In 1835 and the following year he acted as brigadier-general in the British Auxiliary Legion in Spain, and took part in almost every engagement. In May, 1836, we find him commanding the Irish Brigade in the successful attack on the heights before San Sebastian, and for his services on this occasion he was nominated a Knight Commander of the Spanish Order of San Ferdinand. More recently he held for many years the chief commissioner-ship of the police force at Manchester. Sir Charles married in 1841 Louisa Hannah, only daughter of the late Major Martin Curry, of the 67th Regiment of Foot. Sir Charles Shaw died at Homburg, where he had been residing for some years past, and, as he had the Waterloo medal, was buried with military honours. Prussian and French officers attended.

SIR ANTHONY STERLING.

Sir Anthony Coningham Sterling, K.C.B., died at South Lodge, Knightsbridge, in his 67th year, on March 1. The gallant officer, who was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, entered the army in 1826, and served in the Eastern campaign of 1854 and 1855, first as brigade major, and afterwards as assis-

tant adjutant-general to the Highland Division, commanded by Gen. Sir Colin Campbell, and took part in the battles of the Alma, Balaclava, and Inkermann, and remained with the Highland Division during the entire siege and fall of Sebastopol. For his services during the war he was made a Companion of the Order of the Bath, and, in addition to the medal and clasps, was made an officer of the Legion of Honour, and received the Turkish medal and the decoration, fourth class, of the Order of the Medjidie. He was placed on half-pay in November, 1855, on account of ill-health, and finally retired from the service in October, 1857. He subsequently served as assistant-adjutant-general to the Inspector-Gen of Militia. On the outbreak of the Indian Mutiny in 1858, Colonel Sterling was selected by Sir Colin Campbell as his military secretary, and accompanied the latter to India. In recognition of his important services he was created in 1860 a Knight Commander of the Order of the Bath. The late Sir A. Coningham Sterling was the son of Captain Edward Sterling by Hester, daughter of Mr. Coningham, and was born at Dundalk in 1805.

April.

MR. J. B. CHATTERTON

The most celebrated of our professors of the harp died at his residence in Manchester-street, April 9, in his 67th year. He was son to a professor of music at Portsmouth, and was Bochsá's favourite pupil. He was professor of the harp at the Royal Academy of Music. The last occasion on which he performed was at the wedding of her Royal Highness the Princess Louise, at Windsor Castle, March 21.

THE JUDGE-ADVOCATE GENERAL.

The Right Hon. John Robert Davison, M.P. for Durham, the Judge-Advocate-General, died suddenly on Saturday, April 15, while on a visit to Mr. J. St G. Burke, in Suffolk. Mr. Davison had for several years a very large practice at the Parliamentary Bar, and at the general election of 1868 was returned for his native city, Durham. The vacancy which occurred in the office of Judge-Advocate-General in November last was not filled up for some time, pending a consideration of the question whether the office should be retained as a political appointment;

but it was felt that, in a session to be especially devoted to Army measures, Mr. Cardwell required all the Parliamentary assistance available, and Mr. Davison was appointed Judge-Advocate—a position he has lived to enjoy for just three months. He was greatly liked for his kindly personal qualities, and respected for his very great ability. An inquest was held on the body, when it was stated in evidence that Mr. Davison arrived from London, on a visit at The Anberries, in his usual health, that he dined with Mr. Burke and family, and, after smoking a cigar, retired to rest about 12 o'clock. On the following morning about 9, his valet went into his bed-room, but immediately left, thinking that his master was asleep. Shortly afterwards two of Mr. Davison's children went to his bed-side, but he made no reply to them, and it was then found that he was dead. He had evidently been reading, as a Parliamentary Blue-Book was lying by his side. The body, when first seen, was quite warm. It appeared that for some years past Mr. Davison had suffered from heart disease, and had more than once expressed his opinion that this would be the cause of his death. Mr. Davison died on his 45th birthday.

CAPTAIN OGILVY.

The Hon. William Ogilvy was brother to the late Earl of Airhe, and uncle of the present head of the Airhe family. In his youth he entered as a midshipman in the Royal Navy, but an aversion to this profession caused him to give it up, and he entered the army as ensign, and in that capacity battled his way through the Peninsular war, and was present at nearly all the important engagements, such as Vittoria, St. Sebastian, Salamanca, Toulouse, Badajoz, &c. He held the Peninsular medal and seven clasps. At the battle of Waterloo he was with the 52nd Regiment of Foot, and so terrible was the French attack on the quarter in which he belonged that that regiment to which he belonged was stationed, that scarcely a man escaped being killed or wounded. For his heroic daring he was promoted to the rank of captain. After the peace he lived in comparative seclusion till the year 1832, when he was elected member of Parliament for the eastern district of burghs—St. Andrews, Forfar, Montrose, &c. About twenty years ago he built the mansion at Loyal, Alyth, where he made himself much endeared to every one by his various acts of generosity and kindness. He was in his 78th year.

OMAR PASHA,

The celebrated commander of the Turkish army died on the 18th of this month. Omar Pasha was born in 1806, at Plaski, a village in the district of Ogulin, about sixty miles from Fiume, on the Adriatic. He entered the Austrian army, but not liking the service to which he was appointed—that of surveyor of roads and bridges—he deserted, and went to Turkey, where he adopted the Mahometan religion, and after a time obtained an appointment in the army. He first distinguished himself in quelling an insurrection in Syria and Alabama, and in 1848 was made a Pasha. When the Russian troops invaded the Danubian Principalities in 1853, Omar Pasha was appointed Generalissimo of the Turkish army, and his services in that capacity during the Crimean war are well known. His most important public employment since that time was the subjugation of the insurrection in Crete, in 1867. In September, 1865, the Emperor of Austria conferred upon him the Grand Cross of the Order of Leopold.

SCHAMYL.

This month brought to us from Russia the news of the death of Schamyl, the Circassian Chief, so long known to the history of our age as "The Warrior-Prophet of the Caucasus." There was a time when the news of his death would have caused what is called a "profound sensation," but he had passed the allotted threescore years and ten, and his existence for the last few years was comparatively forgotten. Born in the village of Huni, just north of the Caucasus, in the year 1797, Schamyl became, when about thirty years of age, the leader of a National party, half religious and half political, whom he headed in a crusade against the dominion of Russia. The Emperor found that, in his efforts to subdue the mountain tribes of that wild district, he had no opponent with whom he was so little able to cope as the subject of this brief memoir, who was not only animated by patriotism, but whose inspiration was derived from one of the modern reformers of Islamism. In 1831, in one of the attempts of the Russians to subdue the tribes in the neighbourhood of the Caucasus, the Murids were slain almost to a man, and Schamyl fell, pierced by two balls. He, however, recovered, and effected his escape, and helped to renew the unequal contest, though at a great disadvantage. In 1836, on the death of his leader, Kasi Mollah, he was chosen to the command of the

Caucasian tribes, whose power of resistance was such as for years to keep at bay the whole forces of the Russian Empire. In 1857, and the following year, however, the latter gained some important victories over the independent chief, who, in September 1859, was captured by the Russians, under Field-Marshal Prince Bara-tinsky, and carried off into Central Russia. Since that date Schamyl had resided chiefly at or near Moscow, a vanquished enemy and nominally a prisoner, but treated with the consideration and respect which were due to a fallen foe who had never forfeited his character for fair dealing. His adventures, if related at length, would fill a volume. It is sufficient to say here that the object of his life was to effect a union between the Caucasians of the Black Sea and those of the Caspian, and out of them to create a nationality which, strong in its mountain fortresses, and collected under his standard, should defy the power of Russia. It was not his fault that he failed; and, now that he is gone, there can be no harm in expressing the opinion that of all modern religious or semi-religious fanatics of these latter days, few have borne a character more pure and without reproach than the Warrior-Prophet of the Caucasus.

SIR JUSTIN SHEIL, K.C.B.

Major-General Sir Justin Sheil died after a short illness, on April 18, at his residence in Eaton-place. Sir Justin entered the Bengal Native Infantry in 1820, and received the medal and clasp for the siege of Bhurtpoor. He went to Persia in 1833 as second in command of a detachment of officers and sergeants sent to discipline the Shah's army. In 1848 he received permission to accept and wear the first class of the Lion and Sun, conferred upon him by the Shah. In 1844 he was appointed envoy and minister at the Court of the Shah, which post he held till October 21, 1854. He was made K.C.B. in 1855, after a very successful career, in which he gave great satisfaction both to his own Government and to that of the Shah. Sir Justin was brother of the well-known Right Hon. Richard Lalor Sheil, member for Dungarvan.

May.

AUBER.

Daniel François Auber, the composer, died at Paris, on May 13, in the 89th year of his age, having been born in

1782 at Caen. His parents were residents of Paris, but were making a tour in the north when their son was born. Judged from a musical point of view, the representative man of his day, and, under no matter what circumstances considered, the most richly endowed and greatest of French composers, Auber played a conspicuous part in the art history of his country. He who wrote "*La Muette de Portici*" (Masaniello) was neither more nor less than the French Rossini, and in very many respects may be looked upon as quite the equal of that extraordinary genius. At any other time than the present the death of such a man would have created as much excitement in Paris as was created by the death of Rossini, three years ago. But now Auber passed away almost unnoticed by his countrymen, to whose edification and delight he had ministered for upwards of half a century. He died, however, full of years and of glory. Auber had attained his thirty-first year before making his first semi-abortive attempt—forerunner of a series of successes which no other French composer, and indeed no other composer of any country—Rossini, the Italian, alone excepted—has equalled. From 1826 to the beginning of 1828 Auber was silent, but in the early spring of 1828 he composed—not now for the Opéra Comique, but for the great stage of the Académie Royale de Musique—the opera upon which, bearing in recollection all his other masterpieces, his reputation is chiefly based. We refer to "*La Muette de Portici*," known in England, where, for forty years, it has been even more popular than in France, as "*Masaniello*." This magnificent work at once placed its composer on the pinnacle of fame. Many and admirable as were the works that came afterwards from the brain of its prolific and untiring author, not one has surpassed, if any, indeed, has equalled it. It was brought out on February 29, 1828, when Auber was in his forty-seventh year. The fame of Auber is almost, if not quite, as much English as French. From the time that an English version of "*La Muette*" was introduced in London, under the title of "*Masaniello*," about a year later than its production in Paris, work after work by this wonderfully-gifted composer has been essayed at our English theatres. Auber, indeed, though a foreigner, has done more for our lyric stage than Bishop, Loder, Balfe, Wallace, Macfarren, or any native composer. His melodies are as familiar to us as household words, being of such a stamp that, like some of our own English, Irish, Welsh, and Scottish tunes, they can never grow stale, and are en-

dowed with perennial freshness. Auber, who began so late as a dramatic composer, made up for this tardiness by writing operas at an age when it might be fairly imagined that his invention must have been dried up. Altogether, he has given between forty and fifty operas, the last but one of which, "*Le Premier Jour de Bonheur*," although written at the age of eighty-six, is as remarkable for spontaneity as many of the happiest inspirations of his prime. His final opera was "*Rêve d'Amour*," produced at the Opéra Comique on December 20, 1859, about a year later than the "*Premier Jour de Bonheur*." Auber was born, according to some authorities, in 1784, according to others in 1782. It has been vouchsafed to few of his class to see so much, and at the same time to pass a life so unchecked amid vicissitudes which influenced more or less all around him. As a man, independently of his artistic claims, he was wonderfully popular. No less witty than his contemporary and idol, Rossini, a bust of whom was in every room of his house, Auber was at the same time no less amiable and fascinating.

MAJOR-GENERAL DOUGLAS.

Major-General John Douglas, C.B., commanding the Cavalry Brigade at Aldershot, was found dead in his bed on the morning of the 10th. The gallant officer had long served in the 11th Hussars, and succeeded the Earl of Cardigan in the command of the regiment. For some time he was on the staff at head-quarters as assistant adjutant-general of cavalry, and was appointed to his command at Aldershot in January last. He served in the Eastern campaign of 1854-55 in command of the 11th Hussars, including the affair at Bulganak, battles of Alma, Inkermann, and Balaklava, and siege of Sebastopol. For his gallant services he was made a Companion of the Order of the Bath, a Knight of the Legion of Honour, and was decorated with the Fourth Class of the Medjide, and had received the Turkish medal. He entered the army in June 1829.

SIR JOHN HERSCHEL.

On Thursday, the 11th May, European science lost one of her most illustrious men in Sir John Frederick William Herschel, Bart., F.R.S., who died at his seat, Collingwood, near Hawkhurst, Kent. He was the son of that eminent astronomer, Sir William Herschel, who just ninety years since discovered the Georgium Sidus, or Uranus, as it was called at first, but which

is now known by the name of its discoverer—the planet Herschel. His mother was Mary, daughter of Mr Adee Baldwin, and he was himself born at Slough, Buckinghamshire, on the 7th of March, 1792. He received his early education privately, under a Scotch mathematician named Rogers, from whose hands he passed to St. John's College, Cambridge, where he took his Bachelor's Degree in 1813, coming out as Senior Wrangler and first Smith's Prizeman. In the same year he published his first work, "A Collection of Examples of the application of the Calculus to Finite Differences." In 1819 he commenced a series of papers in the *Edinburgh Philosophical Journal* on miscellaneous subjects in physical science, and in 1822 communicated to the Royal Society of Edinburgh a paper on the absorption of light by coloured media, which will be found in the ninth volume of the "Transactions" of that society. He spent a great part of the years of 1821—1823, in conjunction with the late Sir James South, in making a number of observations on the distances and positions of numerous stars, a full account of which is to be seen in Part III of the "Philosophical Transactions" for 1824. In the following year he began to re-examine the numerous nebulae and cluster of stars which had been discovered by his father. On this work he was employed for eight years, and its results will be found in the volume of the above-mentioned work for 1832. The catalogue includes upwards of 2300 nebulae, of which 525 were discovered by Sir John himself. It may be added that while engaged upon this work, he also discovered between 3000 and 4000 double stars, which are described in the "Memoirs of the Astronomical Society." These observations were made with an excellent Newtonian telescope, 20 feet in focal length and $18\frac{1}{2}$ inches aperture; and "having obtained," to use his own words, "a sufficient mastery over the instrument," he conceived the idea of employing it in the survey of the southern heavens.

Accordingly he left England in November, 1833, and reaching the Cape in January, 1834, fixed his residence in the neighbourhood of Table Bay. He there set up his instruments, and was shortly able to commence a regular course of "sweepings" of the southern heavens. His observations were continued till May, 1838, the whole of the expense attending them being borne by Herschel himself. The interest felt by the scientific world of Europe and America in the progress of his labours was very great, and, from time to time, curiosity was gratified by accounts of some of the observations con-

veyed to friends by letter; but it was not until 1847, some years after his return to England, that the collected digested results of his four years' residence at the Cape were published in regular form, when he published his volume entitled "Results of Astronomical Observations made during 1834—1838 at the Cape of Good Hope; being the Completion of a Telescopic Survey of the Whole Surface of the Visible Heavens, commenced in 1825." Although the astronomer's main object in the southern hemisphere, as in the northern, had been the detection of new and the re-examination of old nebulae, his observations extended themselves so as to include all the objects for which his position was favourable. Indeed, not only was a mass of new observations appertaining to the southern heavens added to astronomical science by the survey, but many of the extreme speculations of the elder Herschel and others relative to the highest problems of astronomy were reviewed afresh in the light of the new observations. The substance of these has since been incorporated in all the more recent works of general astronomy. Besides his astronomical labours at the Cape, he was always ready to give the colonial authorities his advice and aid on scientific and educational matters. It is to him that the Cape colonists are mainly indebted for the very perfect system of national education and public schools which they now enjoy, and which he was enabled to carry out through the sagacity and liberality of the late Sir George Napier, at that time Governor, and of his Colonial Secretary, Mr. Henry Montagu.

It is worthy of remark, says a writer in the *English Cyclopædia*, that Herschel's residence at the Cape was productive of benefits not only to astronomy, but also to meteorology. While occupied there he suggested a plan of having meteorological observations made simultaneously at different places—a plan subsequently developed at greater length in his "Instructions for Making and Registering Meteorological Observations at various Stations in Southern Africa," published under official military authority in 1844. He had already received from the hands of King William IV. the Hanoverian Guelphic Order of Knighthood, and on his return to England in 1838 he was received with every possible public honour. During his absence in the southern hemisphere the Astronomical Society had voted to him their Gold Medal in 1836. Two years later, on the occasion of the Coronation of Queen Victoria, he was created a Baronet. In 1839 he was made an honorary D.C.L. of Oxford University,

and there was a proposal, which he declined, to elect him to succeed the late Duke of Sussex in the presidential chair of the Royal Society. In 1842 he was elected Lord Rector of Marischal College, Aberdeen. In 1848 he was President of the Royal Astronomical Society, and in the same year the Society voted him a testimonial for his work on the Southern Hemisphere. Having by that time completed the digest and publication of his observations at the Cape, during the preparation of which, however, he had published various incidental papers in the "Transactions of the Astronomical Society," he was free to pass to other labours. Of these the most important of a literary kind was his work entitled "Outlines of Astronomy" (enlarged from his former treatise in *Lardner's Cyclopædia*), which he published in 1849. In the same year he edited a collection of papers by various authors, published by authority, and entitled, "A Manual of Scientific Inquiry, prepared for the use of her Majesty's Navy, and adapted for Travellers in General." In December, 1850, when the Mastership of the Mint was converted from a Ministerial into a permanent office, it was conferred upon Sir John Herschel, and this post was retained by him till 1855, when he resigned it on account of ill health, and Professor Graham, the eminent chemist, was appointed his successor.

Sir John Herschel was the author of the articles on "Isoperimetrical Problems" and "Mathematics" in the *Edinburgh Encyclopædia*, and of "Meteorology" and "Physical Geography" in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* (the last two of which have been republished separately), and also of several articles on scientific subjects in the *Edinburgh* and *Quarterly Reviews*, which were collected and published in a separate form in 1857, together with some of his lectures and addresses delivered on public occasions. He besides occasionally contributed to *Good Words* some popular papers on the "Wonders of the Universe;" and some two or three years ago he gave to the world, in the pages of the *Cornhill Magazine*, a poetical version of part of the "Inferno" of Dante. He was also one of the too numerous translators of Homer.

Sir John Herschel was an honorary or corresponding member of the Academies of St. Petersburg, Vienna, Göttingen, Turin, Bologna, Brussels, Naples, Copenhagen, Stockholm, and of almost all other scientific associations in England and America. To his other honours was added that of Chevalier of the Prussian Order of Merit, founded by Frederick the

Great, and given at the recommendation of the Academy of Sciences at Berlin. Few philosophers of an age which has produced a Faraday and Brewster have attained distinction equal to that which he earned for himself. His mathematical acquirements and his discoveries in astronomy, in optics, in chemistry, and in photography were all of a very high order, and such as, aided by an admirable style, secured for him the widest reputation among men of science, both at home and abroad; while his numerous popular writings have contributed largely to the diffusion of a taste for science, and an acquaintance with its principles among our countrymen.

Sir John Herschel married, in 1829, Margaret Brodie, daughter of the Rev. Dr. Alexander Stewart, by whom he had a family of nine daughters and three sons.

MR. SECONDARY POTTER.

Mr. Potter, Secondary of the City of London, died on May 11, after a short illness. He had held the office for nearly a quarter of a century.

THE MARQUIS OF WESTMEATH.

George Thomas John Nugent, first Marquis of Westmeath, was a representative peer for Ireland. He was born in 1785, succeeded his father as eighth Earl of Westmeath, 1814, and was raised to the marquessate, 1822. He was a captain in the Coldstream Guards, and served in the expedition to Egypt under Sir Ralph Abercrombie (1801). He was lord-lieutenant of Westmeath, colonel of the Westmeath Militia, and a magistrate for Roscommon. His lordship was thrice married.

LIEUT.-GENERAL WILLIAMS.

The death of Lieutenant-General Thomas Molyneux Williams, K.H., took place on May 10, at the age of 78. He was and had been in declining health for some short time past. Previously to entering the army he served five years as midshipman in the navy, and was engaged in the attack on the French fleet by Admiral Cornwallis on August 21, 1805. He assisted in the disembarkation of the British army in Portugal, in August, 1808, and at its embarkation during and after the battle of Corunna in 1809. He accompanied the expedition to Walcheren the same year, and served in the squadron of gunboats in the Scheldt covering the disembarkation of the army, and at the

bombardment and capture of the fortresses of Ter Vere, Ramakins, and Flushing. He landed with a division of sailors on the island of South Beveland, and was present at the taking of Fort Batz, and at the subsequent defence and repulse of the enemy in their repeated efforts to repossess themselves of that important post; also in frequent gunboat actions co-operating with the army during their evacuation of those islands in 1810. He quitted the navy and entered the army in February 1811, and joined the 4th Regiment in Portugal in August of the same year, and served in that corps and the 77th, into which he was promoted from that period, to the termination of the war in 1814, without being a day absent from his regiment. He was present at the siege and storming of Badajoz, at the operations of the Bidassoa and Adour, and affairs at St Jean de Luz, and at the mayor's house in front of Bidart in December 1813, and, at the investment of Bayonne and repulse of the sortie. He had received the war medal with one clasp for Badajoz, and in 1836 William IV. nominated him a knight of the Royal Hanoverian Guelphic Order. His first commission in the army dates from February 1811.

June.

HON. FREDERICK BYNG.

The senior gentleman usher of the Privy Chamber died on June 5, at his house in St James's Place, at a very advanced age. Mr Byng had been in declining health for the last eighteen months, so that his friends were not unprepared for his death. He was fifth and youngest son of John, fifth Viscount Torrington, by his wife Bridget, daughter of Commodore Arthur Forrest. He was born in 1784, and was page of honour to his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales in 1791. He entered the army as lieutenant in the 27th Light Dragoons in 1799, and in August 1801 exchanged into the 53rd Foot, but went on half-pay in the following year. He was employed for two years in the War Office, which he left on obtaining a clerkship in the Foreign Office, in which department he continued for nearly forty years, and obtained the rank of senior clerk, when, from impaired eyesight, he was compelled to retire on a pension in 1839. The late Mr. Byng was appointed an ensign in the St. George's Volunteer Infantry in August 1803, and was present with his regiment when reviewed by his Majesty George III. In

May 1824 he was appointed by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to attend upon the King and Queen of the Sandwich Islands during their visit to this country in that year. He was appointed one of the gentlemen ushers of the Privy Chamber in March 1831, a Court appointment he held up to the time of his death. Mr Byng was appointed in November 1849 one of the commissioners for inquiring into Smithfield Market, and markets in the City of London for the sale of meat. He joined the ranks of the Queen's (Westminster) Volunteer Rifles in 1859, and was with his regiment when reviewed by her Majesty in June 1860. In the same year he presented to this corps the colours borne by the regiment raised in Westminster in the early portion of the century. The occasion of the presentation was a great event in the annals of the present volunteer movement, and the "Queen's" marched on the parade ground at the back of the Horse Guards 1800 strong.

GENERAL ELLICOMBE.

General Sir Charles Greno Ellicombe, K.C.B., Colonel Commandant of the Royal Engineers, died on June 7, at his residence at Worthing, at the great age of 87 years. The venerable general, who was educated at Woolwich, obtained his first commission as first lieutenant in the Royal Engineers in July 1801. He served in the Peninsula from November 1811 to the end of the war, including the siege and storm of Ciudad Rodrigo, siege and storm of Badajoz, retreat from Burgos, advance of the army and crossing the Ebro, battle of Vittoria, as brigade-major; siege and storm of San Sebastian, July 15 to September 9, 1813, passage of Bidassoa, battles of Nivelle and Nive (December 10, 11, and 12, 1813), passage of the Adour, blockade of Bayonne and repulse of the sortie. Sir Charles had received the gold medal for San Sebastian, and the silver war medal with five clasps for Ciudad Rodrigo, Badajoz, Vittoria, Nivelle, and Nive; and was nominated a Knight Commander of the Order of the Bath in November 1862, when the Prince of Wales came of age, having previously, in May 1856, been made a colonel commandant of his corps. The deceased general was the fifth son of the Rev. William Ellicombe, rector of Alphington, Devon.

GEORGE GROTE.

One of the greatest literary names of the day was George Grote, the historian,

who died on June 18, aged seventy-seven. He was the eldest son of Mr. George Grote, of Badgemoor, Oxon, and was born in 1794, at Clay Hill, near Beckenham, Kent. His ancestors came to this country from Germany, and his grandfather founded, in conjunction with Mr. George Prescott, the banking-house in Threadneedle-street, which still bears the name of the original partners. Mr. Grote was educated at Charterhouse, and entered his father's establishment as a clerk in his sixteenth year. His leisure was for many years afterwards spent in unremitting study. About 1823 he commenced the compilation of a "History of Greece," upon which he steadily laboured till the Reform movement of 1830-31 called him forward into public life. He espoused the cause of Reform, and in December 1832 successfully contested the City of London, which he represented in three successive Parliaments, until his retirement in 1841. His first publication was a pamphlet in reply to Sir James Macintosh's "Essay on Parliamentary Reform" in the *Edinburgh Review*. It was printed anonymously in 1821. He had since written a small work on the "Essentials of Parliamentary Reform," an article on Clinton's "Fasti Hellenici," in the *Westminster Review*, and another on Niebuhr's "Heroic Legends of Greece," in the *London and Westminster Review*. In Parliament he was considered to have in especial charge the advocacy of the ballot, a question upon which he made an annual motion. He had for some time retired from active participation in politics, and had thus been able to devote his entire attention to the production of his admirable "History of Greece," which was completed in 1856. Mr. Grote married in 1820, Harriet, daughter of Mr. Thomas Lewis, a lady of an old Kentish family, who is known as the authoress of "The Life of Ary Scheffer," and other works.

MR. N. E. HARTOG.

Numa Edward Hartog, who died of small-pox at the age of 25, was the first Jew who ever won the blue riband of Cambridge. He was senior wrangler in 1869, at which date he was still, in common with other Nonconformists, excluded from a fellowship, the substantial reward of his exertions; but in the present session he gave important evidence before the Lords' Committee on University Tests, and it is due perhaps to the sympathy which his exclusion excited that the Lords proposed a measure which would have admitted him to a Trinity Fellowship. Before, however, he could

take advantage of the passing of the University Tests Bill, the man who was expected to be the first to reap its fruits had passed away. His friends expected for him a distinguished career either in the public service or at the Bar.

LIEUT.-GENERAL HIGGINS.

Lieutenant-General Thomas Gordon Higgins, Colonel Commandant of the Royal Regiment of Artillery, died on June 20, aged 82. The deceased officer, who entered the army in 1806, commanded the Royal Artillery throughout the Syrian campaign, and the British detachments of the expedition at the bombardment and capture of Beyrout, on October 9, 1840. He also commanded the Royal Artillery at the bombardment and capture of St. Jean d'Acre, on November 3 of the same year. For his distinguished services he was made brevet lieutenant-colonel in 1841, and had received the war medal with one clasp for Syria; the Turkish gold medal; the diamond order, Nisham Iftihar, and sabre of honour from the Sultan for his services in his cause. He was appointed Colonel Commandant of the Royal Artillery on September 20, 1865.

LIEUT.-COLONEL MILLES.

Lieutenant-Colonel the Hon. Lewis Watson Milles, second son of Lord Sondes, died on June 7, in the 42nd year of his age. He served with the 43rd Light Infantry in the Kaffir war of 1851-52, and during the rebellion in India, 1857-58; was wounded at Cawnpore, and received the Kaffir war and Indian mutiny medals.

MR. POLLARD-URQUHART.

William Pollard-Urquhart, M.P., of Kinturk, in the county of Westmeath, and Craigston, Aberdeenshire, was the eldest son of the late Mr. William Dutton Pollard, of Kinturk; he was born at Castle Pollard, county Westmeath, in 1815, and was consequently in the 56th year of his age. He was educated at Harrow and at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he obtained a scholarship, and took a wrangler's degree in 1838. He was a magistrate and deputy-lieutenant for Westmeath, and entered Parliament in 1852 as a Liberal member for that county. This seat he retained till his death. Mr. Urquhart was the author of the "Life and Times of Francesco Sforza, Duke of Milan;" and also of some essays on political economy and pamphlets on taxation.

SIR J. ROLT.

The Right Hon. Sir John Rolt, late Lord Justice of Appeal, died on Tuesday, June 6, at Ozleworth Park, Wotton-under-Edge. The learned gentleman, who was son of the late Mr. John Rolt, an eminent merchant, engaged in the East India trade at Calcutta, was called to the Bar at the Inner Temple in 1837, and made a Queen's Counsel in 1846. He had a large professional practice. In 1847 he unsuccessfully contested Stamford, and was again an unsuccessful candidate for Bridport in 1852. At the general election in 1857 he was returned by the Conservatives for West Gloucestershire, and sat for that division of the county in the House of Commons till his elevation to the Bench in 1867 as one of the Lords Justices of Appeal. On Sir Hugh Cairns (now Lord Cairns) being made, by the late Earl of Derby, a Lord Justice of Appeal in November, 1866, Mr Rolt was selected by Lord Derby as his successor as attorney-general, on accepting which office he received the customary honour of knighthood. In July, 1867, he succeeded Sir G. J. Turner as Lord Justice of Appeal, and was thereupon sworn a member of her Majesty's Privy Council. He was, however, compelled to resign his judicial functions in February of the following year, having been attacked by paralysis. Sir John was born in 1804, and was twice married.

SIR JOSEPH RUDSDELL.

Sir J. Rudsdell, K.C.M.G., died at the age of 88 on the 4th June. He was born at Gainsborough, and entered the army at the beginning of the century. He had seen active service in Sicily, Spain, Italy, Malta, and in the Ionian Islands during the war, and was for sixteen years on the staff in the Mediterranean. From 1824 to 1852 he acted as Chief Secretary to the Lord High Commissioners of the Ionian Islands, and for his services in those dependencies he was honoured with the Knighthood of the Order of St. Michael and St. George. He retired from the army in 1830, being at that time lieutenant-colonel of the Grenadier Guards.

MR. VINCENT SCULLY.

Mr. Vincent Scully, Q. C., who for some years represented the county of Cork in Parliament in the Liberal interest, died, after a short illness, at the age of 60. Mr. Scully, whose presence in the House made itself felt by his habit of speaking,

and at considerable length, upon all sorts of miscellaneous subjects, was the eldest son of the late Mr. Dennys Scully, of Killeacle, county Tipperary, and of Merriem-square, Dublin. He was educated at St. Mary's College, Oscott, and at Trinity College, Dublin, and was also entered at Trinity College, Cambridge, but does not appear to have taken his degree at that University. He was called to the Irish Bar at Dublin in 1833, and in 1849 obtained a silk gown. He was first returned to Parliament for the county of Cork in 1852, and continued to sit for that constituency down to the dissolution of 1857. Re-chosen, however, in 1859, he remained in St. Stephen's till the general election of 1865, when he found himself at the bottom of the poll, and did not again offer himself to his constituents. Mr. Vincent Scully was a zealous but liberal Roman Catholic. Though an advanced Liberal in politics, he was one of those who joined in the vote of censure on Lord Palmerston in 1864; he also voted for the ballot, and strongly supported the repeal of the Ecclesiastical Titles Act, and advocated extensive changes as to the Irish Established Church, and in the law of landlord and tenant in Ireland. He was also not unknown as an author, having contributed largely to "Sausse and Scully's Irish Chancery Reports," and having published a work on "The Irish Land Question," several treatises on "Free Trade in Land," and a work on "The Channel Islands."

DR JAMES WATSON.

This eminent physician, who died at Glasgow at the advanced age of 84, was three times elected president of the Faculty of Physicians and Surgeons, and for many years he was the "father of the faculty"—a title due to him not only in virtue of his seniority, but on account of the paternal interest he long evinced in the well-being of the Corporation. So highly did the faculty appreciate his many and valuable services that they have hung his portrait in the Faculty Hall, and founded a prize in his honour, which bears his name.

July.

SIR THOMAS ACLAND.

Sir Thomas Dyke Acland, Bart., of Columb John, in the county of Devon, died at his seat Killerton, near Exeter, on

July the 22nd, at the age of 84. In 1812 he entered Parliament in the Tory interest, as one of the members for Devon, and continued to represent the county till 1831, when he retired for a time. After the county was divided by the Reform Bill he was elected in 1837 for North Devon, which seat he retained till 1857, when he finally retired from public life. Wilberforce, Hannah More, and Sir Robert Inglis were among his early friends, and he was associated with the religious party to which their names belong. After his retirement from Parliament he lived quietly at his country seat, occupying himself with agricultural improvements and the duties of a resident magistrate and landowner. His widespread benevolence and kindly geniality to all within his sphere, together with his territorial influence, rendered him perhaps the best known and most universally beloved and respected member of the old squirearchy of Devon.

DR. KEITH JOHNSTON.

This well-known geographer was born at Kirkhill, near Edinburgh, 1804, and educated at the High School with a view to the medical profession. He however became apprentice to an engraver, and acquired that artistic skill which has characterized his works. He early commenced the study of geography, with a view to founding a school of that science in his own country, and having mastered the works of the best English and foreign writers, published his "National Atlas" in 1843. This procured him the honour of being appointed Geographer to the Queen for Scotland. Mr. Johnston was best known for having made, on a large scale, the application of physical science to geography. He was, at different times, elected honorary or corresponding member of the principal geographical societies of Europe, Asia, and America, and a Fellow of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, and the University of that city in 1865 conferred upon him the honorary degree of LL.D. His writings on medical geography procured him the diploma of the Epidemiological Society of London, and for the first physical globe he was awarded the medal of the Great Exhibition of London, in 1851. He died on the 9th of July in his 67th year.

COLONEL MANN.

Colonel Frederick William Mann died in Guernsey on the 28th of July, at the age of 89. He was the youngest son of

General Gother Mann, R.E. His military career extended over a long period. He served at the capture of Genoa and Malta; in Germany under Lord Cathcart; with Sir John Moore in Sweden, Portugal, and Spain, including the retreat to Corunna; and under Sir John Doyle in the construction of military roads in Guernsey. In 1813 and 1814 he was in the Peninsula, with the army under Wellington, and was distinguished at the passage of the Bidasoa. He wore a medal and clasps for Nivelle and Toulouse. Since the period of his retirement from the army in 1841, Colonel Mann resided in Guernsey, occupying himself in military literature and in the invention of several mechanical improvements.

DEAN MANSELL.

Henry Longueville Mansell, D.D., Dean of St. Paul's, was born October 6th, 1820. He received his education at Merchant Taylor's school, obtained a scholarship at St. John's College, Oxford, and was eventually elected Fellow of that College. In 1843 he took a double first class degree, and was ordained. In 1855 he was appointed reader in Moral and Metaphysical Philosophy at Magdalen College; he was Bampton Lecturer for 1858; in 1859 was made Waynflete Professor of Logic, in 1866 Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Oxford, and Canon of Christ Church. He succeeded Dr. Milman as Dean of St. Paul's in 1868. He was the author of several works on religious and abstruse philosophical subjects. His Bampton lectures for 1858, on the "Limits of Religious Thought," in which he brought the metaphysical doctrines of Sir William Hamilton to bear on the subject of Christian evidence, attracted a great deal of attention, and were the groundwork of an elaborate controversy between himself and Professor Maurice. Dr. Mansell died very suddenly while on a visit at Cosgrove Hall, Northamptonshire, on the 31st of July.

August.

CHARLES BUXTON.

Charles Buxton, Esq., of Fox Warren, Surrey, M.P., F.R.G.S., died on the 10th of August. He was born Nov. 18, 1823, being the third son of the late Sir Thos. Fowell Buxton, Bart., M.P., of Colne Hall, Norfolk, by Hannah his wife, fifth daughter of the late John Gurney, Esq., of Earham, Norfolk. He completed his education at Trinity College, Cambridge, where

he graduated M.A. in 1843. Mr. Buxton, a magistrate for the counties of Norfolk and Surrey, and a partner in the well-known extensive brewing firm of Messrs. Truman, Hanbury, and Co., sat in Parliament, in the Liberal interest, for Newport, from 1857 to 1859; for Maidstone from 1859 to 1865, and for East Surrey from the latter year till his decease. He was author of several works, amongst others a *Life of Sir Fowell Buxton*, "Ideas of the Day on Policy," and "National Education in Ireland."

ADMIRAL KINGCOME.

Admiral Sir John Kingcome, K.C.B., died August 7th, at Plymouth. He entered the navy in 1808, and was present at the destruction of the French shipping in Aix roads, in April, 1809. In command of the "Bellisle" troopship he proceeded in her to China in 1841, and arrived there in time to witness the closing operations on the Yangtse Kiang. On a summons to join the Baltic fleet, he got ready the "Royal William" with great rapidity, and with a crew composed in great part of old pensioners, went over to Calais, embarked 1386 French troops, whom he landed at Bomarsund for operations against the forts, and brought back 800 Russian prisoners. In September, 1857, he was made Rear-Admiral, and in November, 1861, was appointed to the command of the Pacific station, which he held for two years. In 1865 he was created a K.C.B., the Duke of Somerset notifying that this was an acknowledgment of long and faithful services. He retired on full pay and with a Greenwich Hospital pension in 1866, and became a Full Admiral on 10th September, 1869. Admiral Kingcome was 77 years of age at the time of his death.

September.

RICHARD BENTLEY.

This well-known publisher belonged to an old Shropshire family. His father was principal accountant of the Bank of England. Mr. Bentley was founder, in conjunction with Charles Dickens, of the periodical known as *Bentley's Miscellany*. In the year 1845, in association with the Hon. Sydney Smythe and the Young England party, he endeavoured to found a newspaper representing their views, and called *Young England*. This attempt, however, did not meet with success. Charles Dickens, Lord Lytton, Captain Marryat, Dr. Maginn, Father Prout,

Ingoldsby, Fenimore Cooper, Sam Shek, and Prescott were among the numerous authors for whom he published. Mr. Bentley died on the 10th of September, in the 77th year of his age.

WILLIAM BLENKIRON.

The owner of the Middle Park stud died on the 25th of September, in his 64th year. He was born in Yorkshire, and was intended for a farmer, but he abandoned this calling, and commenced a manufacturing business in London, which was afterwards carried on by his eldest son. About the year 1847 he became the owner of a filly named Glance, which may be said to have laid the foundation of the great Middle Park stud. For three or four years little progress was made, but in 1852 he moved from Dalston, where the Glance filly had been kept in the back garden, to Middle Park, and some half-dozen brood mares were on the books of the establishment. Caractacus was the first famous horse bred by Mr. Blenkiron; and the Rake, Hemit, Marksman, Léonie, Typhæus, and Bicycle were some of the best that were ever sent out from Eltham. Mr. Blenkiron added for four years 1000*l.* to the great Middle Park Plate. He was highly respected for his uniform uprightness and honesty.

SIR T. DEANE.

Sir Thomas Deane, Kt., President of the Royal Hibernian Academy, was born in county Cork, Ireland, in the year 1792. He rose to great eminence as an architect, among the chief works with which his name is associated are, the old and new Savings' Banks, the Bank of Ireland, and the Commercial-buildings and Court-house at Cork. He was a magistrate for the county of Cork, and twice served the office of high sheriff of Cork, namely, in 1839 and 1851. Sir Thomas Deane received the honour of knighthood, at the hands of the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, in 1830, in recognition of his public services and professional attainments. He died on the 2nd of September, at his residence near Dublin.

THE RIGHT HON. GEORGE HAMILTON.

The Right Hon. George Alexander Hamilton, D.C.L., J.P., and D.L., of Hampton Hall, in the county of Dublin, one of the Commissioners of Church

Temporalities in Ireland, formerly M.P. for the University of Dublin, and for many years Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, died on the 17th of September. He was born August 29th, 1802, the elder son of the Rev. George Hamilton, of Tyrella, in the county of Down, and received his education at Rugby, and Trinity College, Oxford. In 1826, 1830, and 1832, he contested unsuccessfully, in the Conservative interest, the county of Dublin; but in 1835 he was seated for the city of Dublin, after a petition against the return of O'Connell. Defeated at the election of 1837, he was returned in 1842 for the Dublin University, which he continued to represent until 1859, when he was appointed Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. He had previously been Financial Secretary in Lord Derby's Administration of 1852. To Mr. Hamilton was mainly owing the formation of the Conservative Society for Ireland.

CANON JELF.

The Rev. Richard William Jelf, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, died at the canon's residence there, on the 19th of September. This learned and able divine was born about the year 1798, the son of the late Sir John Jelf, of Oaklands, in the county of Gloucester. He received his education at Eton and Christ Church, Oxford, where he graduated in 1820. Shortly after he was elected a fellow of Oriel; in 1823 he took holy orders; in 1825 he acted as one of the Public Examiners; in 1826, having resigned his fellowship, he was appointed tutor to Prince George of Cumberland, now ex-King of Hanover, and in 1839 he was nominated to a stall in Christ Church Cathedral. In 1844 his high character for sound learning and for a most kind and amiable disposition secured for him the important post of Principal of King's College, London, in succession to Dr. Lonsdale—a post which he occupied with credit and distinction for many years. As a writer, Dr. Jelf was not voluminous; but his sermons, especially the celebrated one on the “Via Media of the English Church,” are much appreciated.

DR. MORTIMER.

The Rev. George Ferris Whidborne Mortimer, D.D., died September 7th, at Hampton, in the 67th year of his age. He was in early life a Michael's Scholar at Queen's College, Oxford, where he took his Bachelor's degree in Michaelmas Term, 1826, obtaining a first class in the school of *Literæ Humaniores*. He pro-

ceeded M.A. in 1829, and for many years held the Head Mastership of the City of London School, which he raised from a very low ebb to several hundred boys, being warmly seconded in his labours by the Corporation of London, and especially by Aldermen Hale and Salomons. On his retirement he was succeeded by the Rev. Edwin A. Abbott. Dr. Mortimer was much beloved by his old pupils, and to the very last used to make a point of being present at the distribution of prizes in the school theatre, where he was sure of a warm and hearty welcome. He was nominated in 1864 to a prebendal stall in St. Paul's Cathedral, which he held till his death.

MR. CHIEF JUSTICE NORMAN.

The Hon. John Paxton Norman, Assistant Chief Justice of Bengal, whose assassination at Calcutta, on the 20th of September, is recorded in our Chronicle, was born on October 21st, 1819. He belonged to a Somersetshire family, and was educated at the grammar-school of Exeter, from whence he proceeded to Exeter College, Oxford, where he took his degree in 1841. After studying at the Temple he practised for many years as a special pleader, but was called to the Bar in 1862. He was the author of many legal treatises and papers, the most important of his writings being, “A Treatise on the Law and Practice relating to Letters Patent for Inventions,” and the “Exchequer Reports,” of which jointly with Mr. Hurlstone, he was editor for several years previously to his leaving England. In May, 1861, Mr. Norman was appointed, under Lord John Russell's Administration, one of the Judges of the High Court of Bengal. In the year 1864, when Sir Baines Peacock was in England, he filled the office of Chief Justice, which he was again occupying, in the absence of Sir. R. Couch, at the time of his death.

BISHOP PATTESON.

The Right Rev. John Coleridge Patteson, D.D., first Bishop of Melanesia, was the son of Sir John Patteson, formerly a Judge in the Queen's Bench, and nephew of Sir J. Taylor Coleridge. He was born in 1827, educated at Eton and Balliol College, Oxford, and became Fellow of Merton in 1850. Having resolved to devote himself to a missionary life, for which, in addition to his zeal and activity, he possessed a special qualification in his extraordinary aptitude for acquiring languages, he laboured for some years under Bishop Selwyn, in New Zealand, and

the neighbouring islands, and in 1861 was consecrated Bishop of Melanesia. The remaining ten years of his life he spent in cruising about among the islands that composed his diocese, exerting all his influence for the improvement of the natives, by whom he was greatly beloved. He raised his voice vainly against the practice which has for some years been carried on of kidnapping the natives of the South Sea Islands for the purpose of supplying the labour-market of Queensland and other colonies. It appears that this infamous trade was the cause of the Bishop's death. He was cruising among the islands in the month of September, when he heard that a vessel was on her way to Santa Cruz to obtain labour. Anxious, if possible, to avert or mitigate the evil, he resolved to visit the island himself. On approaching the shore (on the 20th) he went off in a boat, which he quitted for one of the native canoes in order to land. As soon as he was out of sight, a volley of arrows was let fly at the English boat, wounding some of the sailors and Mr. Atkin, the Bishop's chaplain. Shortly afterwards the natives were seen to turn a canoe adrift, which was found to contain the dead body of the Bishop, rolled up in a mat. A small branch of the cocoa-nut palm with five knots in it was stuck in the mat. These knots were supposed to signify that the Bishop's life had been taken in revenge for five lives of the natives, who had probably been shot by the kidnappers. Mr. Atkin also died of his wounds after a few days of great suffering.

SIR JAMES PENNETHORNE.

This eminent architect died on the 1st of September. He was continuously employed since 1832 as surveyor to her Majesty's Works, and to the Commissioners of her Majesty's Woods and Forests. He carried out a large number of metropolitan improvements, among the most notable of which are the formation and laying out of Victoria and Battersea Parks, the General Record Repository in Fetter-lane, the new west wing of Somerset House, the south wing of Buckingham Palace, and the University of London, Burlington-gardens. Sir James was born in 1801, and was knighted in 1870.

CIPRIANI POTTER.

This distinguished musician died at the age of 79, on September 28th. Mr. Potter was one of the first to recognize and appreciate the vast genius of Beet-

hoven, and spent a considerable time at Vienna under the great composer's influence. As an excellent pianist in the solid classical school, as a systematic teacher of his art, practical and theoretical, and as a composer for his instrument and for the orchestra, Mr. Potter left a name that will ever stand high in the annals of English music.

For many years he held the office of Principal of the Royal Academy of Music, and among the many musicians trained by him may be mentioned Sir W. Sterndale Bennett.

DR. SOLLY.

Dr. Samuel Solly, F.R.S., well known in connexion with medical literature and the profession generally, died on the 24th of September. In early life he pursued his studies at St. Thomas's and Guy's Hospitals, in 1828 was admitted a member of the Royal College of Surgeons, and in 1813 became a Fellow of that learned institution. In 1856 he was elected to the Council of the College, in 1862 was appointed Professor of Human Anatomy and Surgery, and in 1867 was promoted to the Court of Examiners (which position he soon afterwards resigned), and became senior vice-president of the college. Dr. Solly contributed largely to medical journals, and was author of several important works, amongst others those on the "Human Brain," "Surgical Experiences," and "An Analysis of Muller on the Glands."

October.

CHARLES BABPAGE.

Charles Babbage, F.R.S., the eminent mathematician, was born December 26th, 1792. His father, Mr. Benjamin Babbage, was a banker, of the firm of Fraed, Mackworth, and Babbage. The family was settled in Devonshire, and Charles as a child was sent to the grammar-school at Totnes, in that county. At the usual age he was entered at Cambridge, and took his Bachelor's degree from Peterhouse, in 1814. While at Cambridge, in conjunction with Sir John Herschel and Dean Peacock, he endeavoured to introduce into that university the refined analytic method of teaching mathematics which was in vogue on the Continent, and the triumvirate published several original and translated works on the subject. While pursuing the practical application of his mathematical studies, Mr. Babbage hit

upon the invention with which his name is mostly associated by the general public—that of the calculating-machine. The Government of the day, with Sir Robert Peel and Goulburn at its head, at first patronized the invention, but ultimately took alarm at the prospect of the enormous expense involved in its completion, and withdrew its support. The machine, upon which Mr. Babbage, out of his small fortune had already spent some thousands, was presented, together with drawings illustrative of its operation, to King's College, London. Mr. Babbage was, in 1828, nominated to the Lucasian Professorship of Mathematics at Cambridge, which chair he occupied for eleven years. His candidature for Finsbury, at the general election of 1832, was unsuccessful. He was a member of the Royal Society, and one of the founders of the Astronomical and Statistical Societies. His published works fill about eighty volumes. He died on October 18th, at his residence in Dorset-square.

MATTHEW BELL.

Matthew Bell, Esq., of Woolsington, near Newcastle-on-Tyne, died on the 26th of October, at his country-seat, in the 79th year of his age. He was born in 1793, educated at Eton and Christ Church, and succeeded his father in 1811. In 1816 he served the office of sheriff of Northumberland, and was appointed in 1826 lieutenant-colonel of the Northumberland and Newcastle regiment of yeomanry cavalry, which he commanded above forty years. In the same year he was brought forward as a candidate for the vacancy in the representation of Northumberland, which had occurred through the sudden death of his uncle, Mr. Brandling, and after a severe contest with the Honourable Henry Liddell (afterwards Lord Ravensworth), he was returned by a majority of thirteen. In the first Reformed Parliament, in 1832, he came in for South Northumberland, after another contest with his old opponent, Mr. Beaumont, and his own cousin, Mr. Ord. This was his last contest, for from 1832 until his voluntary retirement in 1852, "honest Matthew Bell" (as Conservatives and Liberals alike called him) was always returned unopposed.

SIR JOHN BURGOWNE.

Field Marshal Sir John Fox Burgoyne, G.C.B., son of the Right Hon. John Burgoyne, was born in 1782. Educated at Eton and at Woolwich, he obtained at an early age a commission in the Royal

Engineers, and took part in Sir Ralph Abercrombie's expedition to the Mediterranean in 1800. His spirited conduct at the capture of Alexandria and the siege of Rosetta, in 1806, gained special mention in the official despatches at the time. He was present at the memorable retreat on Corunna, and assisted in laying Sir John Moore in the grave. He took an active part in the subsequent Peninsular war, under Sir Arthur Wellesley, and having attained the rank of colonel, was first or second in command at most of the sieges which took place during its course. Before its conclusion, however, he was appointed commanding engineer of the expedition to New Orleans, under Sir Edward Pakenham; and here, also, his services were highly appreciated. He was not present at the battle of Waterloo, but joined the Army of Occupation at Paris afterwards.

During the forty years' peace which followed, Sir J. Burgoyne led no inactive life. For thirteen or fourteen years, he was Chairman of the Board of Public Works in Ireland; in 1845 he was appointed Inspector-General of Fortifications, and whilst holding that office, wrote an official letter to the Duke of Wellington, on the state of national defence which attracted great attention at the time. He was an active member of the Irish Famine Commission of 1847.

Just before the Crimean War broke out, Sir John was sent to Constantinople to report on the measures necessary for the defence of the Ottoman Empire; and as soon as the war was determined on, he was appointed lieutenant-general, and commissioned to supervise the landing of the troops in the Crimea. He was present at the battles of the Alma, Balaklava, and Inkerman, and conducted the siege operations before Sebastopol till March, 1855, when he was recalled to England, in consequence of the popular discontent at the slow progress of the war, though, on more than one occasion, Lord Raglan had borne high testimony to the value of his services. After the fall of Sebastopol honours fell thick upon him. He was advanced to the rank of full General, created a Baronet, appointed Colonel Commandant of the Royal Engineers, and subsequently received the bâton of Field Marshal. He received the honorary degree of D.C.L. at Oxford, and the French Emperor and the Sultan of Turkey each bestowed on him their highest military decorations. On the death of Lord Combermere, in 1865, Sir John Burgoyne was appointed constable of the Tower of London, and Lord-Lieutenant and Custos Rotulorum of the Tower

Hamlets. Almost the last occasion on which he appeared in public was at a meeting inaugurating the National Red Cross Society for Aiding the Sick and Wounded in War, of which he was an active member. In September, 1870, he had the misfortune to lose his only son, Captain Hugh Burgoyne, R.N., in the ill-fated "Captain," and he never fully recovered from the shock. He died at his house in Pembroke Square, on October 7th. He married, in 1821, Miss Charlotte Rose, daughter of a Fairshire gentleman; she survived him only a few weeks, dying on the 5th of December.

JAMES DARK.

Mr. James Henry Dark, who was born of a Devonshire family in 1795, began life in a humble capacity in Lord's Cricket Ground. As a cricketer he never rose to a first-class place in any one department of the game. From his great practical knowledge of cricket he was often chosen as arbiter on disputed points, and his decision was rarely at fault. By degrees he advanced so prosperously, that in 1836 he purchased the unexpired lease of Lord's Ground, then held by Mr. Ward, and two years after he erected a spacious tennis court, with billiard and bath rooms attached. Since the transfer of his interest in Lord's Ground to the M.C.C. his functions ceased. Mr. Dark died on the 17th of October.

LORD DUNRAVEN.

Edwin Richard Windham Wyndham-Quin, Earl of Dunraven and Mountearl, in Ireland, and Baron Kenry of the United Kingdom, was born May 19, 1812. He was the eldest son of Windham Henry, second Earl of Dunraven and Mountearl, by Caroline, his wife, daughter and sole heiress of Thomas Wyndham, Esq., of Dunraven Castle, Glamorganshire, and was the representative of the O'Quins of Munster, one of the few families of Celtic origin in the Irish Peerage. His extensive property in Wales came to him from his mother, the great heiress of the Wyndhams of Dunraven. From 1837 to 1850 he sat in Parliament as Lord Adare, for the county of Glamorgan, and in the latter year succeeded his father in his peerage honours. Lord Dunraven was essentially an Irishman, deeply versed in the literature and archaeology of his country; a lover and patron of every thing Irish, a resident landlord, and an amiable and accomplished gentleman. His beautiful manor-house of Adare, and the old monastic ruins which surround it, and

which he restored to religious and educational purposes, are the chief ornaments of the county of Limerick, of which he was Lord-Lieutenant. His Celtic and mediæval learning, and his antiquarian studies, were widely known and appreciated; and to him Montalembert dedicated one of the volumes of "The Monks of the West" in a Latin inscription, gracefully referring to the ancestry, the personal worth, and the varied attainments of the Earl. Lord Dunraven was the author of "Memorials of Adare;" and at the period of his death was directing his investigations to the subject of Irish Crosses. He died on the 6th of October, and was succeeded by his only son, Viscount Adare.

SIR HENRY HARINGTON.

Sir Henry Byng Harington, K.C.S.I., was born in 1808, the eldest son of Henry Hawes Harington, Esq., of Madras. In 1824 he entered the Bengal military service of the Hon. East India Company, and was present at the siege and capture of Bhurtpore, 1825. In 1828 he was transferred to the civil service and, having filled several minor offices, was constituted an additional member of the Council, and became subsequently a member of the Supreme Council. He was appointed Lieutenant-Governor of the North-Western Provinces of India in 1863, which post he resigned in 1865, and the following year he was made a Knight Commander of the Star of India. Sir Henry died on the 7th of October.

SIR FRANCIS MOON.

Sir Francis Graham Moon, Bart., J.P. for Westminster, Middlesex, and London, a Chevalier of the Legion of Honour, died on the 13th. He was born in 1796, the youngest son of Mr. Christopher Moon. A man of remarkable taste and judgment, possessed also of great energy, perseverance and industry, he made for himself, as a print publisher, not only a fortune, but a position in the world. He became the successor of the well-known art-patron, Old Boydell. He was connected with the firm of "Moon, Boys, and Graves," carrying on at the same time his own business in the city, where he reproduced some of the finest works of Sir D. Wilkie, Sir C. Eastlake, Sir E. Landseer, D. Roberts, S. Prout, C. R. Leslie, and others, and became associated with some of the most eminent men in art and literature of the day. In 1843 he was elected Sheriff of London and Middlesex; in 1844, Alderman of Portsoken Ward, and in 1854,

Lord Mayor. During the tenure of the civic chair he had the honour of receiving at Guildhall, in April, 1855, the Emperor and Empress of the French, and in recognition had a baronetcy conferred upon him.

SIR RODERICK MURCHISON.

Sir Roderick Impey Murchison, Bart., K.C.B., the eldest son of a gentleman of ancient Highland family, was born at Tarradale in Ross-shire, February 19, 1792. Being destined for the army, he was sent, after an early education at Durham, to the Royal Military College at Great Marlow, and thence, after a few months' study at the Edinburgh University, he obtained his commission in 1807, and joined the army in the Peninsula under Lord Wellington, carrying the colours of his regiment (the 36th Foot) at Vimera, and earning the reputation of an able officer. After the peace of 1815, and his marriage with a daughter of General Francis Hugonin, Captain Murchison began to devote his attention to scientific subjects, particularly geology, placing himself under the tuition of Mr. Richard Phillips, F.R.S. After making geological expeditions in various parts of England and Scotland, he instituted, in 1830, a special examination of the border-land between Wales and Shropshire and Herefordshire. He there discerned evidence of a special system of rocks, to which he gave the name of Siluria, after the Silures, the ancient inhabitants of that part of Britain. His great work "Siluria," published some years later, is devoted to the examination of the Silurian deposits in all parts of Europe, throughout which his personal observations had been very extensive. In 1840 Mr. Murchison was employed in a geological survey of Russia, after which he published a volume on "The Geology of Russia and the Ural Mountains." On a comparison of some specimens of Australian rock with that of the Ural districts he was led to suspect the existence of gold in Australia, and called attention to the fact in papers read before various scientific societies from 1841 to 1843. In 1848 he addressed a letter to Earl Grey on the subject, but no attention was paid to it, and it was not till 1851 that the discoveries which had by that time been made in the Australian colonies were taken up by Government.

Sir Roderick, who was knighted in 1846, acted for some years as secretary to the Geological Society, of which he was twice elected President. He was one of the most active promoters of the British Association for the Advancement of Science,

founded in 1830, and he was President several years of the Geographical Society, occupying the chair until a short time before his death. He took the liveliest interest in geographical discoveries, and supported with special energy the efforts of his great friend and fellow-countryman Dr. Livingstone, in whose safety he held up to the tune of his death a persistent belief, in spite of all rumours to the contrary. In 1853 Sir Roderick was appointed Director General of the Geological Survey of Great Britain, and of the Museum of Practical Geology. In 1863 he received the order of Knight Companion of the Bath, and in 1866 was created a Baronet. He was Fellow of the Royal and Linnæan Societies, President of the Hakluyt Society, and also a member of various foreign academies. Sir Roderick died on the 22nd of October, at his house in Belgrave Square, from an attack of bronchitis; his health had been failing for some time previously.

DR. SEEMANN.

Dr. Berthold Seemann, the celebrated traveller and botanist, was born at Hanover in 1825. After an education in that city he obtained the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at Göttingen, and was appointed in 1846 naturalist on board her Majesty's ship "Herald," in which capacity he made a voyage round the world and three cruises to the Arctic regions in search of Sir John Franklin. In 1860 he accompanied, as botanist, the expedition sent out by the Colonial Office to the Fiji Islands, and he likewise explored, in a private capacity, many parts of North and South America. As a scientific writer, Dr. Seemann was widely known by his "Narrative of the Voyage of H.M.S. 'Herald,'" published in 1853, an "Account of a Government Mission to the Viti or Fiji Islands" in 1862, and several botanical works. He was also a frequent contributor to the leading scientific journals of London, and editor of the "Bonplandia," and the "Journal of Botany, British and Foreign." He was Fellow of the Linnæan Society of London, and Vice President of the Imperial German Academy *Naturæ Curiosorum*. Dr. Seemann died on the 10th of October, at the Javal Mine, in Nicaragua.

ICHABOD WRIGHT.

Ichabod Charles Wright, Esq., of Maplerley Hall, Notts, died at Burwash, Sussex, on the 14th. He was born April 11, 1795, and was a descendant of the

Wrights of Osmaston Manor, in the county of Derby, being the representative of a junior branch which was well known as a great banking house at Nottingham. Mr. Ichabod Wright received his education at Eton, and at Christ Church, Oxford, and was formerly Fellow of Magdalen. He married Theodosia, daughter of Lord Chief Justice Denman, by whom he left five sons and two daughters. Mr. Wright was a man of distinguished literary and classical attainments. His version of Dante's "Divina Commedia," is one of the standard translations in the English language.

November.

DR ROCK.

The Very Rev. Daniel Rock, D.D., died on the 28th of November. He was born at Liverpool in 1799, and was educated at Old Hall in Hertfordshire, and subsequently at the English College at Rome. After serving for some years as domestic chaplain to Lord Shewsbury at Alton Towers, he was appointed priest in charge of the Roman Catholic congregation at Buckland, near Faringdon, Berks, on the property of the Throckmorton family. In 1852, soon after the establishment of the Roman Catholic hierarchy, he was nominated Canon of the New Cathedral "Chapter" of Southwark. He was the author of several theological works, of which the best known is the "Hierurgia, or an Exposition of the Sacrifice of the Mass," in which he illustrated the various ceremonies which are used in the Church among the Latins, Greeks, and Oriental Christians, not only by written evidences, but also from paintings, sculptures, and inscriptions found in the Catacombs of Rome and in other places. In 1862, Dr. Rock, as a member of the Committee of the South Kensington Museum, took a very active part in carrying out the objects of the special loan exhibition of mediæval works of art, and he contributed to the official catalogue an article illustrative of the ecclesiastical vestments, embroideries, &c., there exhibited.

MR. TINNEY.

Mr. William Henry Tinney, Q.C., died at Torquay, at the age of 88 years. Mr. Tinney took high honours at Oxford, and was in due course elected a fellow of his College (Oriel). He was called to the Bar in 1811, and was made a Queen's Counsel and Benchers of Lincoln's Inn in 1829, and ultimately a Master in Chan-

cery. He was eminent as a real property lawyer, and was one of the Real Property Commissioners with Lord Campbell. On the abolition of the Master's offices he retired with a pension of £2500 a year.

December.

LORD CHESTERFIELD.

Philip Cecil Arthur Stanhope, seventh Earl of Chesterfield and Baron Stanhope, born Sept. 28, 1831, succeeded to the peerage on the death of his father in 1866. He was educated at Eton, held a commission in the Royal Horse Guards for a few years, and represented the Southern Division of Notts from 1860 to 1866. He died unmarried on the 1st of December of typhoid fever, supposed to have been caught at the same place and time as that which nearly cost the life of the Prince of Wales.

LORD ELLENBOROUGH.

Edward Law, first Earl of Ellenborough, son of Lord Chief Justice Ellenborough, was born in 1790. After an education at Eton and Cambridge he entered Parliament in 1814, but was soon removed to the Upper House on succeeding his father as Baron Ellenborough in 1818. He first took office in 1828, as Lord Privy Seal in the Duke of Wellington's Administration. In 1834 he was appointed President of the Board of Control in Sir Robert Peel's Government, and when that statesman again became Premier in 1841 Lord Ellenborough returned to his former post. He shortly afterwards, however, accepted the office of Governor-General of India, where he arrived early in 1842. Under his administration in that country was undertaken the expedition into Afghanistan under Generals Pollock and Nott, which resulted in the recapture of Ghuznee and Cabul, and the rescue of Lady Sale and the other British captives. The conquest of Scinde by Sir Charles Napier in 1843 was also undertaken by Lord Ellenborough's Government, but his policy did not meet with the approval of the Court of Directors of the East India Company, and in 1844 he was recalled by that body in the exercise of their legal powers. The Duke of Wellington, however, defended Lord Ellenborough's policy in Parliament, and on his return home he was created an earl, and decorated with the Grand Cross of the Bath. From January to July, 1846, he filled the post of First Lord of the Admiralty in Sir Robert Peel's Administra-

tion, and in 1858 he undertook for two months, under Lord Derby's Administration, his former office of President of the Board of Control. After this time he did not again take office, but he continued to be a most powerful and eloquent speaker in the House of Lords. Lord Ellenborough was twice married, but left no children, his earldom consequently expired with him. He was succeeded in the barony by his nephew, Charles Edmund Law.

MR. GASPEY.

Mr. Thomas Gaspey died on the 8th at Shooter's Hill at the age of 83. For more than sixty years he was connected with English periodical literature. He was early in life employed as a parliamentary reporter for the *Morning Post*, and subsequently became sub-editor of the *Courier* and part proprietor and editor of the *Sunday Times*. Some years later he was engaged upon the *Morning Chronicle*, and edited the evening edition of that paper, in which "Sketches by Boz" first appeared. Mr. Gaspey also wrote several novels.

JUSTICE GEORGE.

Mr. Justice George was the son of a Dublin merchant, and was born in that city in 1804. He was called to the Irish Bar in 1826, and to the English in the following year. He sat in Parliament, in the Conservative interest, for the county of Wexford from 1852 to 1857, and again from 1859 to 1866, when he was appointed Justice of the Queen's Bench in Ireland, and member of the Privy Council for Ireland. He died on the 15th inst.

MR. GREATHEAD.

The oldest Freemason in England, probably the oldest in the world, Mr. Matthew Greathead of Richmond, in Yorkshire, died on the last day of the year, in his 102nd year. He entered the Lennox Lodge, No. 123, of Freemasons, in the year 1797, and was a member seventy-five years. At the annual appointment of officers, on the 27th of this month, he was appointed inner guard.

GEORGE HUDSON.

Mr. George Hudson, once well known by his sobriquet of the "Railway King," died on the 14th of December, at the age of 70. Shortly after the first railways were opened in England, Mr. Hudson's name appeared among shareholders and directors, and when the York and North

Midland Bill was passed in 1837 he became chairman of that company. In the course of the next few years, he had made enormous sums by his speculations, till, in 1848, came the great railway crisis which shook his prosperity. From 1845 to 1859 he represented Sunderland, in the Conservative interest; he was a deputy-lieutenant for Durham, and three times Lord Mayor of York. During the latter years of his life he was in great pecuniary difficulties, and several of his friends in the North subscribed to purchase an annuity for him. His popularity was great at Sunderland and Whitby, to both which places he had been a generous benefactor.

LORD KENMARE.

Thomas Browne, third Earl of Kenmare, in Ireland, and Baron Kenmare in the Peerage of the United Kingdom, was born in 1789. He served with the 40th regiment, in the Peninsular war, from 1808 to 1813, earned clasp at most of the great battles fought during its course, and was one of the gallant band who stormed the castle of Badajoz, under Sir Thomas Picton. He afterwards exchanged into the 16th Lancers, and was with the Army of Occupation in France, after the battle of Waterloo. Lord Kenmare died on the 26th of December, and was succeeded by his son Valentine, Viscount Castlerosse.

MR. MARRIOTT.

The Rev. Wharton Booth Marriott, B.D., who died on the 16th inst., at the age of 48, was known as a sound scholar and theologian. He held for some time a mastership at Eton College, and though obliged by ill-health to resign it a few years before his death, he continued to reside at Eton, and laboured zealously to benefit the poor of the neighbourhood. He held an appointment, as Public Lecturer and Select Preacher, in the diocese of Oxford. A treatise of Mr. Marriott's on the "Origin of Ecclesiastical Vestments," adducing the testimony of antiquity against the exaggerated views of the Ritualists, was especially distinguished for ability and research.

SIR EDWARD MORRIS.

Sir Edward Finucane Morris, K.C.B., colonel of the 49th regiment of Foot, who died on the 4th of December, was born in 1792; he entered the army in

1810, as ensign in the 49th Foot, and served with that regiment till November, 1843, when he retired on half-pay on account of ill-health. He served in Canada at the actions of Fort George, Stony Creek, and Plattsburg, and also at the Cape of Good Hope and in Bengal. He commanded a brigade at the storm and capture of the heights above Canton, and for his services there he was nominated a Companion of the Bath. He subsequently commanded the troops at Ningpo, in the absence of the Commander-in-Chief; and was afterwards appointed an Aide-de camp to the Queen. He attained field rank in 1854, became a full General in 1868, and was appointed to the colonelcy of the 49th regiment of Foot in 1861.

ADMIRAL RAMSAY.

Sir William Ramsay, K.C.B., son of Sir Alexander Ramsay, of Balmah, Kincardineshire, was born in 1796, and entered the navy in 1809. He was present at the battle of Navarino, in 1827, and served as first lieutenant on board the "Atholl," on the coast of Africa. In 1831, while in command of the "Black Joke" tender, he fell in with, and after a long action, boarded and carried the "Marnerito," a Spanish slaver brig, of 303 tons, equipped in complete man-of-war order. He attained flag rank in 1864, and became a full admiral in 1870. He was nominated a Knight Commander of the Order of the Bath in 1869. Sir William died at Edinburgh, on the 3rd of December.

MRS. RYVES.

Mrs. Ryves, whose case was frequently before the law courts as claiming to be recognized as a princess of the blood royal, died on the 7th inst., at the age of 74. She was daughter of John Thomas Serres, a painter, and marine draughtsman to the Admiralty, and granddaughter of one of the original Royal Academicians. Her mother believed, or pretended herself to be the Princess Olive of Cumberland, daughter of his Royal Highness Henry Frederick, Duke of Cumberland, brother to George III. Mrs. Ryves was married to Anthony Thomas, son of Captain Ryves, of Rans-ton Hall, Dorset, but had obtained a divorce from him in the Ecclesiastical Court.

SIR JAMES SCARLETT.

General Sir James Yorke Scarlett, C.C.B., was the second son of the first Lord Abinger, many years Chief Baron of the Exchequer. He was born on the 1st of February, 1799. He entered the army in the year 1818, having obtained a commission in a Hussar regiment, he subsequently exchanged to the Carbineers, and in 1830 was appointed Major in the 5th Dragoon Guards. He became a colonel in the army in 1851; at the commencement of the Russian war, in 1854, was appointed to the command of a brigade of cavalry, and in the following year he was promoted to the command of the cavalry division. General Scarlett was among the foremost at Balaklava, and was wounded before Sebastopol, and for his services in the Crimea was nominated a Knight Commander of the Bath, and also a Commander of the Legion of Honour. In October, 1865, he was appointed to the command of the troops at Aldershot, which he held till 1870. He became a Major-general in 1854, and Lieutenant-general in 1862, and was appointed to the colonelcy of the 5th Dragoon Guards in 1860; in 1869 he was promoted to the Grand Cross of the Order of the Bath. Sir James was for several years honorary Colonel of the 40th Middlesex, and also of the 3rd Lancashire Rifle Volunteers. He died on the 6th of December.

THE BISHOP OF VICTORIA.

The Right Rev. George Smith, D.D., first Bishop of Victoria, died on the 14th at the age of 56. The first few years of his clerical life were passed in parochial work in Yorkshire, but he soon resolved to devote himself to missionary labours, and in 1844 was nominated to a station at Hong Kong. This mission he worked with such extraordinary assiduity and success that the church rapidly extended, and it was determined to establish an episcopal see, to include the island of Hong Kong and the congregations of the Church of England in China. Dr. Smith was consecrated the first bishop in 1849, and continued to discharge the duties of his office until 1865, when ill-health compelled his retirement. Bishop Smith was the author of several books of travel in the Chinese countries, as well as of some theological works.

REMARKABLE TRIALS.

I.

THE VOYSEY CASE.

THIS celebrated ecclesiastical case, involving a charge of heresy against the Rev. Charles Voysey, Vicar of Healaugh, Tadcaster, and instituted by the Archbishop of York, was argued before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in November, 1870

On the 14th of June, 1869, the Bishop of London issued a commission under the Church Discipline Act, to his Vicar-General and certain clergymen, and by a report, dated the 10th of July, 1869, the Commission reported that there was sufficient *prima facie* ground for instituting further proceedings against the appellant, for the commission of an offence against the law ecclesiastical, by having printed and published, within the diocese of London, certain books, in which he maintained doctrines contrary and repugnant to the Articles of Religion and the Formularies of the Church of England.

The Archbishop of York thereupon requested the official Principal of the Chancery Court of York to issue a citation or decree under the seal of the Court, citing the appellant to appear and answer certain articles, and on the 28th day of July, 1869, a citation was accordingly issued.

The appellant appeared, and articles were exhibited on behalf of the respondent

The articles were thirty-eight in number

Article 1 stated that, by the laws, statutes, constitution, and canons ecclesiastical of this realm, all clerks and ministers in holy orders of the United Church of England (hereinafter called the said Church) are required in their preachings, teaching, writings, and publications, faithfully and without reservation, to adhere to and maintain the doctrines of the said Church as set forth in the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, agreed upon by the Archbishops and Bishops of both Provinces, and the whole clergy in the Convocation holden in London in the year 1562, for the avoiding of diversities of opinions, and for the establishing of consent touching true religion, and ratified by royal authority, and in the book entitled "The Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the use of the United Church of England and Ireland; together with the Psalter, or Psalms of David, and the Form and Manner of Making, Ordaining, and Consecrating of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons" (hereinafter called the Book of Common Prayer): and that any minister or clerk in Holy Orders of the said Church who shall maintain or affirm, or pro-

mulgate, or declare in his preaching, teaching, writings, or publications, any doctrine contrary or repugnant to or inconsistent with any of the doctrines of the said Church, as contained in the said Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, and the said Book of Common Prayer, as by the said laws, statutes, constitutions, and canons ecclesiastical, to be punished and corrected according to the gravity of his offence, and the exigency of the law.

The 2nd article alleged that the appellant had been for some years past, and now was, a clerk in holy orders, and that in the year 1864 he was licensed to perform the duties of perpetual curate of the perpetual curacy of Healaugh, in the county, diocese, and province of York.

The 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th articles charged that the appellant printed, published, and set forth, within the diocese of London, a book entitled "The Sling and the Stone for the year 1867;" and a certain other book entitled "The Sling and the Stone for the year 1868;" and a certain other book entitled "The Sling and the Stone for January, 1869;" and a certain other book entitled "The Sling and the Stone for February, 1869."

The 7th, 8th, and 9th articles of charge contained passages taken from the appellant's works, "The Sling and the Stone." The material passages will be found referred to in the judgment.

The 10th article alleged that in the passages set forth in the 7th, 8th, and 9th articles the appellant had maintained, or affirmed and promulgated the doctrine, position, or opinion, that Christ had not made an atonement or reconciliation for sin, and has not been made a sacrifice to reconcile His Father to us, or a doctrine, position, or opinion to that effect; which said doctrine, position, or opinion, is contrary and repugnant to, and inconsistent with those parts of the 2nd, 15th, and 31st of the Articles of Religion respectively, and those parts of the Book of Common Prayer respectively set out in the 14th article of charge.

The 11th article alleged that in the passages set forth in the 7th, 8th, and 9th articles, the appellant had maintained or affirmed, and promulgated the doctrine, position, or opinion, that there is no need of any atonement or sacrifice, nor any place for such in the purpose of God, or a doctrine, position, or opinion, to that purpose or effect, which said doctrine, position, or opinion, is contrary and repugnant to and inconsistent with the 2nd, 15th, and 31st of the Articles of Religion respectively, and those parts of the Book of Common Prayer respectively set out in the 14th article of charge.

The 12th article alleged that in the passages set forth in the 7th, 8th, and 9th articles, the appellant had maintained, or affirmed and promulgated, the doctrine, position, or opinion, that Christ did not bear the punishment due to our sins, nor suffer in our stead and for us, and that to think that He did, or that it was necessary that He should so suffer, is infinitely erroneous and dishonouring to God, and is the most revolting of all the popular beliefs, which doctrine, position, or opinion is contrary and repugnant to or inconsistent with the 3rd and 15th Articles of Religion respectively, and those facts respectively of the Book of Common Prayer set forth in the 14th article of charge.

The 13th article charged that in the passages, and in each of them set forth in the 7th, 8th, and 9th articles of charge, the appellant had maintained, or affirmed and promulgated, the doctrine, position, or opinion that the commonly-received doctrine of intercession and mediation by Christ, and atonement or reconciliation to God by the death of Christ, are all opposed to the

perfect harmony and simplicity of the love of God, and to the teaching of Jesus Christ Himself, or a doctrine, position, or opinion to that purport or effect; which said doctrine, position, or opinion, so maintained, or affirmed and promulgated, by the appellant as aforesaid, is contrary and repugnant to, or inconsistent with, the 2nd, 7th, and 31st of the Articles of Religion respectively, and those parts respectively of the Book of Common Prayer set forth in the 14th article of charge

The 14th article set out the Articles of Religion and Formularies of the Church alleged to have been contravened by the appellant in the passages set out in the 7th, 8th, and 9th articles of charge. Articles 15 and 16 set out other passages from the appellant's work, "The Sling and the Stone," the material passages of which will be found in the judgment. The 17th article alleged that in the passages set forth or referred to in the 15th and 16th articles the appellant had maintained, or affirmed and promulgated, the doctrine, position, or opinion that mankind are not by nature born in sin and the children of God's wrath, and are not separated from God by sin, and under His wrath, or under a curse, and that they are not in danger of endless suffering, nor is there any curse to remove by the shedding of the innocent blood of Christ, and that the doctrine of the fall of man is contrary to the teaching of Jesus Christ, or a doctrine, position, or opinion to that purport or effect, which said doctrine, position, or opinion, so maintained or affirmed and promulgated by the appellant as aforesaid, is contrary and repugnant to, or inconsistent with, the 2nd and 9th of the said Articles of Religion, and those parts respectively of the Book of Common Prayer which are set forth or referred to in the 19th article of charge.

The 18th article alleged that in the passages set forth or referred to in the 15th and 16th articles the appellant had maintained, or affirmed and promulgated, the doctrine, position, or opinion that mankind need no atonement or justification, that salvation is not through justification, and that the doctrine of justification by faith is contrary to the teaching of Jesus Christ, or a doctrine, position, or opinion to that purport or effect; which said doctrine, position, or opinion, so maintained, or affirmed and promulgated, by the appellant as aforesaid, is contrary and repugnant to, or inconsistent with, the 2nd or 11th of the said Articles of Religion respectively and the Homily in the said 11th article mentioned, and that part of the Book of Common Prayer which is set forth in the 19th article of charge

The 19th article set forth the Articles of Religion and the formularies contravened by the passages contained in the 15th and 16th articles of charge

Articles 20, 21, and 22 set out other passages from the appellant's work, "The Sling and the Stone," the material parts of which are referred to in the judgment. Article 23 alleged that in the passages recited and referred to in the 20th, 21st, and 22nd articles of charge the appellant had maintained, or affirmed and promulgated, the doctrine, position, or opinion that our Lord Jesus Christ is no more very God, or very God begotten, not made, than we men are, or a doctrine, position, or opinion to that purport or effect, which said doctrine, position, or opinion is contrary and repugnant to, or inconsistent with, the 1st, 2nd, 4th, and 8th of the Articles of Religion respectively, and those parts respectively of the Book of Common Prayer which were referred to in the 28th article of charge.

Article 24 alleged that in the passages set forth and referred to in the 20th,

21st, and 22nd articles of charge the appellant had maintained, or affirmed and promulgated, the doctrine, position, or opinion that the worship of Christ is idolatry, and is inconsistent with the worship of the true God, and that it is an instance of holding up our hands to a strange god, and outrivals the worship of the one true God, and draws away our highest homage and affection from God to another, or a doctrine, position, or opinion to that purport and effect; which said doctrine, position, or opinion is contrary and repugnant to, or inconsistent with, the 1st, 2nd, and 8th of the Articles of Religion respectively, and those portions respectively of the Book of Common Prayer which were set forth or referred to in the 28th article of charge.

Article 25 alleged that in the passages recited and referred to in the 20th, 21st, and 22nd articles of charge the appellant had maintained, or affirmed and promulgated, the doctrine, position, or opinion that the very idea of the incarnation of the Son of God takes its rise in unbelief, and springs out of absolute infidelity, or a doctrine, position, or opinion to that purport and effect; which said doctrine, position, or opinion is contrary and repugnant to, or inconsistent with, the 2nd and the 8th of the Articles of Religion, and those parts respectively of the Book of Common Prayer set forth or referred to in the 28th article of charge.

Article 26 alleged that in the passages recited and referred to in the 21st and 22nd articles of charge the appellant had maintained, or affirmed and promulgated, the doctrine, position, or opinion that the expected return of Christ to judge the world takes its rise in unbelief, and springs only out of absolute infidelity, and that such expectation is unreasonable, is opposed to the simplicity of the love of God as a Father, and is calculated to overthrow the moral government of God, or a doctrine, position, or opinion to that purport and effect; which said doctrine, position, or opinion, is contrary and repugnant to, or inconsistent with, the 4th and the 8th of the Articles of Religion, and those parts of the Book of Common Prayer set forth in the 28th article of charge.

Article 27 alleged that in the passages recited and referred to in the 20th, 21st, and 22nd articles of charge, the appellant had maintained or affirmed and promulgated the doctrine, position, or opinion that the worship of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost is the worship of three Gods, and that the worship of the Son and of the Holy Ghost is idolatry, and that the belief in the Godhead of the Son and the Holy Ghost, as expressed in the Nicene Creed, weakens and disguises the belief in one God the Father, and obliterates the true name of God, or a doctrine, position, or opinion to that purport or effect, which said doctrine, position, or opinion is contrary and repugnant to or inconsistent with the 1st, 2nd, 5th, and 8th of the Articles of Religion respectively, and those parts of the Book of Common Prayer set forth in article of charge 28.

The 28th article of charge sets out the Articles, and the parts of the Book of Common Prayer alleged to be contravened by the passages contained in the 20th, 21st, and 22nd articles.

Articles 29 and 30 set out further passages from the appellant's works, "*The Sling and the Stone*," the material parts of which will be found in the Judgment.

Article 31 alleged that in the passages set out in the 29th and 30th articles of charge, the appellant had maintained or affirmed and promulgated, in derogation and depraving of the Holy Scripture, the doctrine, position, or

opinion, that revelation of the knowledge of God by means of any book is impossible, that all true knowledge of God comes directly from the law of God written in men's hearts, that all knowledge of God comes only from men's own senses of what He requires them to do, and that the only true revelation possible by God to man is through the sense of God's presence, and is originated in the heart of man independently of God's written Word, or a doctrine, position, or opinion to that purport and effect; which said doctrine, position, or opinion is contrary and repugnant to, or inconsistent with, those parts respectively of the 6th and 20th of the Articles of Religion, and those parts of the Book of Common Prayer referred to in the 35th article of charge.

Article 32 alleged that in the passages set out and referred to in the 29th and 30th articles respectively, the appellant had maintained, or affirmed, and promulgated the doctrine, position, or opinion that in God's Word written, Holy Scripture, and Holy Writ, there are found manifest, palpable, and irreconcilable contradictions, and many places which cannot be expounded, but so that they be repugnant to others, or a doctrine, position, or opinion to that purport and effect; which said doctrine, position, or opinion is contrary and repugnant to, or inconsistent with, those parts of the 6th and 20th of the Articles of Religion respectively, and those parts of the Book of Common Prayer set forth in the 35th article of charge.

Article 33 alleged that in the passages referred to in the 30th article of charge, the appellant had maintained, or affirmed, and promulgated in derogation and depraving of Holy Scripture, the doctrine, position, or opinion that the authority of the Gospel according to St. John is doubtful, and that the said Gospel ought not to be applied to establish any doctrine, and that whole chapters of the said Gospel are crowded with passages which represent Jesus Christ as speaking words which He never could have spoken, and which, if spoken, would not have been believed, or a doctrine, position, or opinion to that purport and effect, which said doctrine, position, or opinion is contrary and repugnant to, or inconsistent with, those parts respectively of the 6th of the Articles of Religion, and those parts of the Book of Common Prayer set forth in the 35th article of charge.

Article 34 alleged that in the passages and in each of them referred to in the 30th article of charge, the appellant had maintained, or affirmed and promulgated, the doctrine, position, or opinion that the Gospel according to St. John contains passages which can only be expounded so that they be repugnant to each other, or to other places of God's Word written, or Holy Scripture; and that the character of our Lord Jesus Christ, as set forth in the said Gospel, is quite irreconcilable with the idea of His being a true teacher sent from God, and is entirely different from the character of the Christ of the other three Gospels, or a doctrine, position, or opinion to that effect; which said doctrine, position, or opinion is contrary and repugnant to, or inconsistent with, those parts of the 6th and 20th of the Articles of Religion respectively, and those parts of the Book of Common Prayer set forth or referred to in the next article of charge.

Article 35 set out the Articles of Religion and parts of the Book of Common Prayer, and also part of the Homilies, which the appellant had contravened in the passages referred to in the articles of charge No. 29 and 31.

The 36th article of charge referred to the four volumes of the appellant's

work "The Sling and the Stone," in proof of the charge. The 37th and 38th articles were merely of a formal character

The appellant prayed that these articles might be rejected. He also moved that they might be reformed. On the 2nd of December, 1869, the Official Principal, by his decree, admitted the articles, and condemned the appellant in the costs.

From this Judgment Mr. Voysey appealed to the Privy Council, before whom he appeared, and was heard in person on the 10th November, 1870. The Solicitor-General (Sir J. Coleridge), Sir R. Palmer, Mr. Archibald, and Mr. Cowie, appeared against him; and on the 11th of February, 1871, the Lord Chancellor (the Archbishop of Canterbury, Lord Chelmsford, and the Dean of Arches being also present) delivered the following Judgment:—

In this case the Rev Charles Voysey, Vicar of Healaugh, in the diocese of York, appeals from a sentence or decree of the Judge of the Chancery Court of the province of York, in a cause wherein the office of the Judge was promoted by the respondent against the appellant by virtue of letters of request from his Grace the Archbishop of the province.

The appellant is charged with having offended against the laws ecclesiastical by writing and publishing within the diocese of London certain sermons or essays, collected together in parts or volumes, the whole being designated by the title of "The Sling and the Stone," in which he is alleged to have maintained and promulgated doctrines contrary and repugnant to, or inconsistent with, the Articles of Religion and Formularies of the Church of England.

The offence being alleged to have been committed in the diocese of London, a Commission of Inquiry was issued by the Bishop of that diocese, and the Report of the Commissioners and the depositions of witnesses were transmitted to the Archbishop of York, in whose diocese the preferment held by the appellant is situate.

On the 28th of October, 1869, articles were exhibited on behalf of the respondent containing the several charges made against the appellant

The appellant, in person, appeared and opposed the admission of those articles, and on the 22nd of December, 1869, the Judge, after hearing counsel for the respondent, admitted the articles and condemned the appellant in the costs of the opposition to their admission. From that sentence the appellant presented his present appeal, by which he asked that the sentence or decree so made might be reversed, and further that this Committee would retain the cause and hear and fully determine the same. The respondent in the case also made the same request as to the retaining and final determination of the whole cause.

The Committee heard the appellant in person on that part of his application which sought to reverse the decision of the court below as to the admission of the articles, and at the conclusion of his argument informed the counsel for the respondent that they were of opinion, subject to further discussion on the part of the respondent, that the 13th article could not be sustained, but that the other articles had been properly admitted. They at the same time informed the appellant, that such admission of the articles would not prejudice his right at the hearing to dispute the validity of the charges contained in the articles, as constituting an offence against the laws ecclesiastical.

Then Lordships, after consideration of the peculiar circumstances of the

case, further stated that they would be ready to retain the cause if both parties should continue to be desirous that that course should be taken, and should enter into proper admissions for that purpose. Accordingly, after taking time for consideration, the counsel for the respondent agreed to the withdrawal of the 13th article of charge, and both parties entered into formal admissions, enabling the Committee to retain and finally determine the case on its merits.

The respondents were then heard by counsel in support of the charges made by the articles, and the appellant was heard in person in answer to the whole case as contained in the articles (reformed by the omission of the 13th), and the Solicitor-General was heard in reply.

The Committee have now, therefore, to determine whether or not the offences charged by the articles, or any of them, have been established.

The articles have been framed in accordance with the principles laid down in several cases by the Court of Arches and by this Committee. The incriminated passages of the appellant's work are fully cited. The Articles of Religion and Formularies of the Church which those passages are alleged to contravene are specifically referred to, and are also fully set forth.

The first of the articles of charge formally states the character of the alleged offence.

The next five articles of charge aver the publication of the appellant's work. The 7th, 8th, and 9th articles of charge contain copious extracts from such publications.

By the 10th, 11th, and 12th articles of charge the appellant is charged with asserting, in the extracts above-named, several propositions inconsistent with the doctrine contained in the 15th and 31st Articles of Religion and certain parts of the Book of Common Prayer (set out in the 14th article of charge) with reference to the atonement or reconciliation for sin made by Christ.

The 13th article we rejected, because it charged the appellant with opposing "commonly-received doctrines," which received doctrines, not being distinctly specified, their Lordships could not assume to be the same as those contained in the Articles of Religion or Formularies of the Church.

The 14th article of charge sets forth in full the Articles of Religion, and parts of the Book of Common Prayer, alleged by the previous articles to be contravened.

The 15th and 16th articles of charge set forth a second set of extracts from the appellant's publications.

By the 17th article the appellant is charged with contravening the doctrines of original sin and the fall of man as specified in the 9th of the Articles of Religion, and the parts of the Book of Common Prayer set forth in the 19th article of charge.

The 18th article of charge alleges that the appellant has contravened, in the second set of extracts, the doctrine of justification by faith, as asserted in the 2nd and 11th of the Articles of Religion, and the Homily in the 11th of such Articles, and the parts of the Book of Common Prayer mentioned in that behalf in the 19th article.

The 19th article of charge then proceeds to set forth the particular passages of the Articles of Religion, and of the Book of Common Prayer, and of the Homilies alleged to be contravened.

The 20th, 21st, and 22nd articles of charge set forth a third set of passages from the appellant's publication, and

By the 23rd, 24th, and 25th articles of charge the appellant is alleged to have contravened in these passages the doctrine of the Divinity or Godhead of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the doctrine of incarnation, as contained in the 1st, 2nd, 4th, and 8th Articles of Religion, and the parts of the Book of Common Prayer set forth in subsequent articles of charge.

By the 26th article of charge the appellant is charged with denying the return of Christ to judge the world, in contravention of the 4th and 8th Articles of Religion and the parts of the Book of Common Prayer set out in a subsequent article.

By the 27th of the articles of charge, the appellant is charged with contravening the doctrine of the Trinity, contrary to the 1st, 2nd, 5th, and 8th of the Articles of Religion and the parts of the Book of Common Prayer set forth in the next article.

The 28th article then proceeds to set out the Articles and parts of the Book of Common Prayer alleged to have been contravened by the third set of extracts, and also certain Homilies of the Church on the same subject.

The 29th and 30th articles of charge set out a fourth set of extracts from the appellant's publication.

By the 31st, 32nd, 33rd, and 34th articles of charge the appellant is alleged by the last-cited passages of his work to have expressed himself in derogation and depraving of Holy Scripture, and especially with reference to the Gospel according to St John.

The 35th article of charge accordingly sets forth the Articles of Religion and parts of the Book of Common Prayer, and also part of the Homilies applicable to the last set of charges.

The 36th article of charge refers to the whole of the publications of the appellant from which extracts have been given, and the last two articles of charge (the 37th and 38th) are formal.

The charges, therefore, against the appellant are thirteen in number, which may be arranged under the following classes.—1. Alleged errors concerning the reconciliation of God to man by the sacrifice or propitiation of our Lord Jesus Christ, and as to the necessity of such reconciliation.—2. Alleged errors as to the Incarnate Godhead of our Lord, and the doctrine of the Holy Trinity.—3. Alleged errors as to the authority of the Scriptures or Holy Writ.

Before examining the charges and comparing the proofs adduced from the appellant's publications with the charges founded thereon, and with the Articles and Formularies of the Church alleged to have been contravened, it will be well to enunciate briefly the rules of judicial exposition with reference to the Articles and Formularies of the Church. In this respect we have the guidance of previous and recent decisions of this tribunal expressed in clear and definite language.

In the cases arising on the work called "Essays and Reviews" (*Williams v. Bishop of Salisbury*, and *Wilson v. Fendall*, 2 Moore, N. S. 425), Lord Westbury, in delivering the opinion of the Committee, said, "Our province is, on the one hand, to ascertain the true construction of those Articles of Religion and Formularies referred to in each charge according to the legal rules for the interpretation of statutes and written instruments, and, on the other hand, to ascertain the plain grammatical meaning of the passages which are

charged as being contrary to or inconsistent with the doctrine of the Church ascertained in the manner we have described."

But it is to be observed, that in inquiries of the nature now before us, the Committee is not compelled, as in cases affecting the right to property, to affix a definite meaning to any given Article of Religion the construction of which is fairly open to doubt, even should the Committee itself be of opinion (on argument) that a particular construction was supported by the greater weight of reasoning. Thus, Lord Stowell, in the case of *Her Majesty's Procurator v. Stone*, thus expresses himself "I think myself bound at the same time to declare that it is not the duty nor inclination of this Court to be minute and rigid in applying proceedings of this nature, and that if any article is really a subject of dubious interpretation it would be highly improper that this Court should fix on one meaning, and prosecute all those who hold a contrary opinion regarding its interpretation. It is a very different thing where the authority of the Articles is totally eluded, and the party deliberately declares the intention of teaching doctrines contrary to them."

We have thought it right to refer to the Canons of construction thus judicially expressed, because on the one hand they allow to the party accused a fair and reasonable latitude of opinion with reference to his conformity to the Articles and Formularies of the Church, and on the other they afford no sanction whatever to the contention of Mr. Voysey, that unless there be found in the publication complained of a contradiction, *totidem verbis*, of some passage in the Articles, he is at liberty to hold, or rather to publish, opinions repugnant to or inconsistent with their clear construction.

As regards those Articles of Religion as to the construction of which a reasonable doubt exists, the question may arise how far opinions of a similar character to those charged to be heretical have been held by eminent divines without challenge and molestation, because the proof of their having been so held may tend to show the *bona fides* of the doubt. In this respect also we have ample guidance from authority, and it will be found that where the Article in question is subject to reasonable doubt, and eminent divines have held opinions similar to those impugned in the case before the Court, that circumstance alone has been held to be of great weight in inducing the Court to allow a similar latitude of construction to the party accused, without itself deciding upon the construction of the Articles.

Thus in the case of *Williams v. the Bishop of Salisbury* (in Moore's P. C. Reports, New Series, vol. ii p. 424) the judgment of the Committee contains this passage:—"It is obvious that there may be matters of doctrine on which the Church has not given any definite rule or standard of faith or opinion; there may be matters of religious belief on which the requisition of the Church may be less than Scripture may seem to warrant; there may be very many matters of religious speculation and inquiry on which the Church may have refrained from pronouncing any opinion at all. On matters on which the Church has prescribed no rule there is so far freedom of opinion that they may be discussed without penal consequences. Nor in a proceeding like the present are we at liberty to ascribe to the Church any rule or teaching which we do not find expressly and distinctly stated, or which is not plainly involved in or to be collected from that which is written."

To proceed, then, to the particular offences charged to have been committed by Mr. Voysey.

In the passages cited from his publication called "The Sling and the Stone," in the 7th, 8th, and 9th articles of charge, he is alleged to have maintained the following positions:—

I. That Christ has not made an atonement or reconciliation for sin, and has not made a sacrifice to reconcile the Father to us (10th art. of charge).

II. That there is no need of any atonement, nor any place for such in the purpose of God (11th article of charge).

III. That Christ did not bear the punishment due to our sins, nor suffer in our stead, and that to think that He did, or that it was necessary that He should suffer, is the most revolting of all the popular beliefs (12th article of charge).

The 13th article of charge we have rejected.

Now, the 2nd Article of Religion expressly asserts that Christ "truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried to reconcile His Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for all actual sins of men." The 15th Article of Religion declares that Christ "came to be the Lamb without spot, who, by sacrifice of Himself once made, should take away the sins of the world." And the 31st Article of Religion declares that "The offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual, and that there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone."

We cannot doubt that these lastly-mentioned Articles of Religion assert in plain language that Christ was crucified to reconcile His Father to us (that is, to mankind), and was a sacrifice, and that He came by the sacrifice of Himself to take away the sins of the world—that the offering of Himself once made is a perfect "propitiation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world"—and that there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone. Neither can we doubt that it is plainly inconsistent with such statements to say that Christ has not made a reconciliation for sin, or has not been made a sacrifice to reconcile His Father to us, or that there is no need for any sacrifice, nor any place for such in the purpose of God.

It will only remain then to inquire as to the first two charges against Mr. Voysey, whether he has, in the passages of his work cited in that behalf, asserted the propositions therein charged.

Before doing so it may be well, however, to observe that when the Articles of Religion speak of sacrifice and of oblation, and speak also of Christ being the Lamb without spot, and of His offering of Himself being a perfect satisfaction, and further allege that there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone, it is impossible to construe the word "sacrifice" in any other sense than that in which it is ordinarily used, viz, as an offering to God, and that as such offering Christ's sacrifice is alleged to be a satisfaction, and the only satisfaction for the sins of the world.

Let us consider, then, the following passages in the appellant's publication as cited in the articles of charge—"He (meaning the Saviour) never hinted at such a doctrine as that of the Fall of Man, or the Atonement by Sacrifice, or Justification by Faith. He never taught that men needed to be accounted righteous before God, or needed any mediator to propitiate His wrath, or to draw them to Himself. All these notions were Jewish, and Christ never gave any sanction or encouragement to them that I have been able to discover."

And, again, "Sincere sorrow for sin is, or ought to be, enough to make a

man quite reconciled and at peace with God; at least so our Lord teaches. We do not, therefore, *need* any atonement or justification. We need no atonement, for God requires none. We do not want to be justified, we do not want to be *accounted* righteous at all when we are not righteous, we only desire to be *made* righteous in God's good time. We seek reconciliation with God as a sorrowful and guilty son seeks reconciliation with a father: 'I will arise and go to my Father,' &c. The Father in Heaven receives and embraces us, only with a compassion more tender, and a love more Divine and inexhaustible. So we leave these Pauline doctrines for those who need them, thanking our Heavenly Father that through His Son Jesus Christ we have learnt a better and surer way to that peace of God which passeth all understanding. The majority of Christians, though fast tending to a change in their views, still maintain, like the Christianized Jews of the first century, a belief in a God who requires sacrifice—actual bloodshedding—mediation instead of personal communion with the sinner, and is the God only of a chosen people; who loves the few that shall be saved, and leaves the rest to be damned, and who only loves and saves the few because Christ had died for them as their sacrifice To us God is a Father and we are His children; and if this be true, it sweeps away the dusty cobwebs of mediation, intercession, sacramental sacrifice, and all the sacred and consecrated follies that grow out of it. We want neither altar nor sacrifice, neither victim nor priest, no sprinkling of blood, nor fumes of burning incense to render our approach to the mercy-seat of God more reverent or more successful. I must own, however, that while I thoroughly and heartily embrace the truth that Christ is our example, I cannot so readily embrace what is often understood by the statement that He is a sacrifice for sin. In one sense, Christ was indeed a sacrifice. His life was sacrificed to the bigotry and blind malice of Chief Priests in Judea. He was a sacrifice, too, in the sense of laying Himself open to persecution by an honest discharge of His duty, and in not trying to escape trouble by a violation of principle.

"Sin, too, caused His death, as it was sinful to bear malice towards One so innocent and good, and still more sinful to put Him to death for the claim which He made for Himself and for us all—that God was His Father and our Father, and that we are His sons. But in what sense the death of Jesus Christ was a substitute for the punishment of your sins or mine I cannot discover. Theologians may be right, but until I can see reasonable ground for their opinion, I must keep my own. I can surely see and thankfully confess that His death has done me good, that His sacrifice has been most beneficial to the world in teaching and encouraging true heroism, true manliness, and true obedience to God's will. Had He not been martyred for the truths which He taught, those truths would probably have been far longer in making their way among men; and England, at this hour, might still have been in Pagan darkness. But then I know this is not the common meaning of the words 'Christ suffered for us,' and I do not wish to pretend to put that meaning on them while I am using them in a totally different sense."

We think that the expressions contained in these passages, and particularly in the last extract, cannot be reconciled with the teaching of the 2nd, 15th and 31st Articles of Religion as regards Christ being crucified to reconcile the Father to us—and the necessity of a sacrifice for sin—and we hold, therefore, that the 10th and 11th articles of charge are proved against the appellant.

As regards the 3rd charge against the appellant, contained in the 12th article of charge, namely, that he has asserted "that Christ did not bear the punishment due to our sins, nor suffer in our stead and for us, and that to think that He did, or that it was necessary He should so suffer, is infinitely erroneous and dishonouring to God, and is the most revolting of all the popular beliefs,"—we may remark that the somewhat uncharitable denunciation by the appellant of all who may happen to differ from him in holding this popular belief is not the substance of the charge. The question is, whether it be or not consistent with the Articles of Religion to deny that Christ bore the punishment due to our sins, or suffered in our stead. We think that to deny this statement without any qualification is inconsistent with the plain meaning of the 2nd and the 15th Articles of Religion already cited: the latter of which Articles is headed, "Of the one Oblation of Christ finished on the Cross," and proceeds to describe that offering to be the perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world. In these Articles also our Lord is described as without spot, i.e. sinless, and as suffering the painful death of the cross, which is styled His offering of Himself, and the result of His suffering so offered is said to be the redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual. It is not consistent with such statements to aver without any qualification that He did not bear the punishment due to our sins, nor suffer in our stead.

The passage we have lastly cited is one in which the appellant might seem to us to admit that he contravenes the Articles of Religion, for he fairly says that the common meaning of the words "Christ suffered for us" is totally different from the sense in which he uses those words. Had the appellant spoken less explicitly, we should have been disposed to regard his denial of the doctrine in question as having reference to some exaggerated statement respecting Christ having borne in hell the punishment due to man's sin; and even as it is, we are not unwilling to give the appellant the benefit of this doubt.

In considering these first three charges, as in the consideration of those that follow, we have been most anxious to arrive at a fair construction of Mr. Voysey's writings, not only by examining the context which he has referred to as bearing on the passages cited, but also by attentively considering whether any previous writer, himself in Holy Orders, has been allowed, with impunity, to assert opinions similar to those of the appellant, so as to afford reasonable ground for holding that the appellant has merely availed himself of the privilege of adopting a possible interpretation of the language of the Articles, although it may appear to us that such interpretation is not sound or correct. But we can find nothing of the kind. The appellant, indeed, constantly refers to his views as being different from generally received doctrine, and he does not in his book, nor has he in his argument, cited any authority of divines holding views corresponding with his own. He founds, indeed, his argument mainly on the denial of original sin, or any original curse occasioned thereby, which assertions form the subject of other articles of charge; and if such be not a correct view of the meaning of the Articles of Religion, it is not surprising that the consequences he has derived from this doctrine should be equally inconsistent with them.

We have not, however, forgotten to observe, that a considerable portion of the appellant's arguments in his writings is directed against special views of

vicarious punishments and imputed righteousness which many divines have held, and which many other divines have considered exaggerated and unreasonable. If he had confined himself to such arguments as he might think fairly adducible in explanation of the doctrine enunciated in the Articles of Religion as to Christ suffering for sin, and offering Himself as a Lamb without spot for all sins original and actual of the whole world, and being crucified in order to reconcile us to His Father, then he would be entitled to claim a latitude of interpretation which has been allowed to others; but he does not profess to interpret, he simply denies the positions asserted in the Articles, and asserts other doctrines inconsistent with and repugnant to them.

We now proceed to consider the 4th and 5th charges made against the appellant, viz., his alleged assertion "That mankind are not by nature born in sin and the children of God's wrath, and are not separated from God by sin, and under His wrath, or under a curse, and that they are not in danger of endless suffering, nor is there any curse to remove by the shedding of the innocent blood of Christ, and that the doctrine of the fall of man is contrary to the teaching of Jesus Christ," contrary, it is contended, to the 2nd and 9th Articles of Religion (see 7th article of charge): and again, "That mankind need no atonement or justification, that salvation is not through justification, and that the doctrine of justification by faith is contrary to the teaching of Jesus Christ," which is alleged to contravene the 2nd and 11th Articles of Religion. (See 18th article of charge.)

Now, the 2nd Article of Religion asserts that the "Son suffered to reconcile the Father to us and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for all actual sins of men," and the 9th Article of Religion, in treating of "original or birth sin," says that "it standeth not only in the following of Adam, . . . but that it is the fault and corruption of every man that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and, therefore, in every person born into the world it deserveth God's wrath and damnation."

We think that the plain meaning of the 9th Article is to assert the existence of original or birth sin, and to state that such sin exists in every one descended from Adam; that by it every man is very far gone from original righteousness, and that this sin "deserves God's wrath and damnation." To assert, therefore, that children are not by nature children of God's wrath—that they are not separated from Him by sin, nor under His wrath, appears to us plainly inconsistent with the express language of the Articles of Religion. It being also expressly laid down that Christ suffered to reconcile the Father to us, and to be a sacrifice for original sin, it appears to us to be in contradiction to such statements to say that we are not under a curse, and that there is no curse to remove by the shedding of the innocent blood of Christ. To assert, also, that the doctrine of the fall of man is contrary to the teaching of Jesus Christ, whereas the 9th Article plainly asserts the doctrine, appears to us to contradict the Article.

The question how far a denial of the doctrine, that man being born in sin is therefore an inheritor of endless suffering, plainly contradicts the Articles, may be open to much more doubt, regard being had to the decision in "*Wilson v. Fendall*" on the subject of assertions of a similar character with regard to the duration of the punishment of the wicked; but with this exception it appears to us to be clear, that if the fourth charge be, in fact, established by

the appellant's writings, the offences therein alleged would be offences against the law ecclesiastical. Do, then, the extracts set out in the 15th and 16th articles of charge bear out the charge?

The appellant in the first of these extracts says, by way of censure of the opinion, "St Paul said plainly that the whole human race should be set free from the curse in consequence of what Christ suffered—'As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive;'" and in the following extract he says, after citing the opinions of Augustine and of Milton, "And though St Paul's doctrine is the most merciful, yet it leaves the mind aghast at the picture of God's cursing the whole race of mankind, and only removing that curse after being appeased by the shedding of innocent blood. This, of course, was simple Judaism, with a little of the genuine Gospel mixed up with it—an immense advance on the pre-existing views, but still far, very far, from the sublime teaching of our Lord Himself." The following extract should also be considered. "He therefore (meaning the Apostle St. Paul) succeeded in teaching many, both Jews and Gentiles, who had superstitions about sacrifice in common, to believe that the death of Christ was a sufficient atonement for the sins of the whole world; and that it appeased the wrath of God entirely, and cancelled the curse against mankind. The arguments used by the Apostle might satisfy the Jews, but could scarcely satisfy us; as, for instance, when he says, 'Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us,' because He was *crucified*, he quotes from some Jewish record that, 'Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree,' as if the mere outward manner of Christ's death could of itself furnish any satisfaction to the human mind that that death removed a curse from the whole race. That such an argument could be used by St. Paul discloses to us how very deep down these Jews were sunk in dogmatic unreasonableness. At all events, he satisfied *them* that as by Adam's disobedience men had fallen from God, so by the death of Christ the curse was removed, and by His obedience He had rendered men righteous in the sight of God. Those who were dissatisfied with the old system at once embraced St. Paul's nobler and more rational views, and thankfully owned Jesus Christ as their Redeemer and Atonement, in a sense which, I do not scruple to declare, was never taught by our Lord Himself. But what could a Jew or Pagan do else?" "They [meaning Ritualists or priests] are (most falsely, as it seems to me) convinced that we are all by nature in danger of endless suffering, and that, unless we obey *them* in thought, word, and deed, unless *they* pray and sacrifice for us, and *they* pardon our offences, there is no hope for us beyond the grave. We do not, then, wish to be ungrateful in declining their interference and in rejecting their control. We simply say to them, 'You have made a fatal error at the very outset of your principles. You have made an entirely false assumption at the very beginning, and therefore we do not wonder that your course is altogether a foolish and mistaken one. You say we are by nature separated from God, or under His wrath—that He will not hear our prayers, or forgive our sins until we have been baptized, and have submitted ourselves to your authority' We deny this entirely. We say that we are *not* separated from God nor under His wrath; that God is always with us all, and we are His children by nature, and therefore we are near and dear to Him all our lives through. With or without your help we need no redemption in the sense in which *you* offer it to us. You are telling us we have got

no friend here while outside your temple; but we know that we are not alone, because our Father is with us, and you can offer no friend, no Saviour, no Comforter, so good, and true, and faithful as *He*. We are therefore not afraid to disobey your injunctions, to tear up your creeds, and to despise your ordinances. For all these are based upon a fundamental mistake."

If in the above extracts the appellant had been simply combating the extreme views which have been adopted by some divines, either with reference to what is commonly called Calvinism on the one hand or Ritualism on the other, we conceive he would have been fully entitled so to do; and we should have been glad if we could have so reconciled his writings with the doctrine contained in the Articles and Formularies of the Church, but the extracts themselves are clearly intended to teach that in no sense are mankind naturally separated from God, or under God's wrath, which he represents to be a false assumption at the very beginning and as occasioning the Ritualists, *on that account*, to take a foolish and mistaken course. It is true that he adds, as a portion of the error taught by them, and which he assumes to be their doctrine, "God will not hear our prayers, or forgive us our sins, until we have been baptized, and have submitted ourselves to your authority," meaning the authority of the priest; and if this had been all it might have admitted of explanation consistent with the doctrine of the Church; but the appellant makes his meaning clear, not only by the previously-cited extract concerning St. Paul's teaching, but what follows the last cited words, "We say that we are not separated from God, nor under His wrath; that God is always with us all, and we are His children by nature, therefore we are near and dear to Him all our lives through," "We know that we are not alone, because our Father is with us, and you can offer no friend, no Saviour, no Comforter, so good, and faithful, and true as *He*."

We cannot doubt that the appellant advisedly contravenes the doctrine of a change of man's natural condition (in which the Church represents him to be subject to God's wrath), through the sacrifice of Christ offered to reconcile His Father to us, and that the 4th charge is therefore established.

As regards the 5th charge against the appellant, we think that to assert that mankind needs no justification, or that salvation is not through justification, or that justification by faith is contrary to the teaching of Jesus Christ, is so plainly opposed to the very words of the 2nd and 11th Articles of Religion, that we need hardly cite them.

We have the advantage of an authoritative exposition, if any were required, of the 11th Article of Religion in the case of *Heath v. Burder*, before the Privy Council (15 Moore's P. C. Reports, p. 82, and *Fremantle*, p. 235), where Lord Cranworth, in delivering judgment, says, "The evident meaning of the 11th Article is, that man is accounted righteous, which in the Article is treated as the same thing as being justified before God, not for his own merits, but for the merits of our Saviour by faith in Him, i. e. that man is admitted to the favour of God, not for his own works, but for the merit of his Saviour and by faith in Him, i. e. by man's faith in our Saviour, howsoever faith is to be defined."

The following extracts from the appellant's book appear to us clear contradictions of these Articles of Religion.

"He (meaning the Saviour) never even hinted at such a doctrine as that of the fall of man, or the atonement by sacrifice, or justification by faith. He

never taught that men needed to be accounted righteous before God, or needed any mediator to propitiate His wrath, or to draw them to Himself. All these notions were Jewish, and Christ never gave any sanction or encouragement to them that I have been able to discover." And again.—"Sincere sorrow for sin is enough to make a man quite reconciled and at peace with God; at least so our Lord teaches. We do not therefore need any atonement nor any justification. We need no atonement, for God requires none."

These six heads of charge complete the first of the three classes of charge and we will proceed to the second class, viz, those relating to alleged errors as to the Incarnation and Godhead of Christ.

Five articles of charge (the 23rd to the 27th inclusive) allege these errors—first, that the appellant asserts (23rd article of charge) "that our Lord Jesus is no more Very God of Very God, begotten not made, than we men are, contrary to the 2nd, 4th, and 8th of the Articles of Religion." Next, that he asserts (24th article of charge) "that the worship of Christ is idolatry, and is inconsistent with the worship of the true God, and that it is an instance of holding up our hands to a strange god, and outrivals the worship of the one true God, and draws away our highest homage and affection from God to another," contrary to the 1st, 2nd, and 8th Articles of Religion. Next, that he asserts (25th article of charge) "that the very idea of the Incarnation of the Son of God takes its rise in unbelief, and springs out of absolute infidelity," contrary to the 2nd and 8th Articles of Religion. Next, that he asserts (26th article of charge) "that the expected return of Christ to judge the world takes its rise in unbelief, and springs only out of absolute infidelity, and that such expectation is unreasonable, is opposed to the simplicity of the love of God as a Father, and is calculated to overthrow the moral government of God," contrary to the 4th and 8th Articles of Religion. And lastly, that he asserts (27th article of charge) "that the worship of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost is the worship of three Gods, and that the worship of the Son and of the Holy Ghost is idolatry, and that the belief in the Godhead of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, as expressed in the Nicene Creed, weakens and disguises the belief in one God the Father, and obliterates the true name of God," contrary to the 1st, 2nd, and 8th Articles of Religion.

The Articles of Religion referred to in the above five articles of charge undoubtedly recognize the Godhead both of the Son and of the Holy Ghost as co-equal with that of the Father, and recognizes them as being with Him one God (1st Article of Religion); that the Son took Man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin of her substance, and that the Godhead of the Son and his Manhood are united in Christ (2nd Article of Religion); that the Son ascended into Heaven, and there sitteth until He return to judge all men at the last day (4th Article of Religion); and that the 8th Article of Religion says that the Nicene Creed, Athanasian Creed, and the Apostles' Creed are to be thoroughly received and believed. If, therefore, the last five articles of charge be proved, they are plainly repugnant to the Articles of Religion.

We think it impossible to read the following passage or extract contained in the 21st article of charge without coming to the conclusion that the 6th charge against the appellant is made out:—"And so God, the Great Unseen Creator, has wedded to Himself the great visible universe, and out of that mystical marriage has come as offspring the human family—a race of beings noble even as animals, but surpassing all we yet know of created life in being

born of God—Very God of Very God—begotten not made, a statement as true of all of us as of Him who was called the first-born among many brethren.” The extracts cited in the 21st article of charge in pp 32 and 33 of the Appendix, clearly describes the worship of Christ as idolatrous, and thus the 7th charge made in the 24th article of charge is also established. We may cite for this purpose the following, amongst other extracts, from pp. 33, 34.

“At the time when Jesus Christ, the Lord of men, appeared on earth, religious feelings towards God, in the hearts both of the Jew and Pagan, were such as to render impossible any repose in the bosom of the Creator. None could conceive of Him as even actuated by tender feelings, or as even guided by laws of justice such as were common amongst men. So the Christ in His life of pity and kindness began to be worshipped and loved as infinitely nearer and dearer to human hearts than any Deity whom men had ever worshipped before. Not only was this perfectly natural, but under the circumstances it was perfectly creditable to mankind that they should worship and adore such a one as Christ was, instead of the Jehovah known to the Jews, and the Zeus and Jupiter known to the Greeks and Romans. Since the days of some of the Psalmists, their purer ideas of Jehovah had become miserably corrupted, and a whole system of propitiatory sacrifices had taken the place of their sensible and manly devotion. . . . But as soon as ever the notion gained ground that Jesus Christ was engaged on man’s behalf, in assuaging the Divine wrath, all the love and trust of men rushed in a torrent towards Him, and they were quite content (as well they might be) to adore their Redeemer, and leave their Creator farther off than ever. I do not wonder at this. The wonder would have been if men had not clung to Christ, if they had refused to worship so glorious a manifestation of Divine love and goodness. Yet, surely this is not what Christ would have of us. I always thought that He came to bring us to God. Whatever else may be recorded in the Gospels, most surely it is there recorded that He said all He could say, and did all He could do, to make men feel the Fatherly love of God for us all, to make known the Father in Heaven, and to win back affrighted men from their ghastly dread. Jesus Christ desired and pressed upon us all to worship the Father—‘His Father and our Father, His God and our God,—’ and none will dare to say that He ever stepped in between men and their Maker to beguile their highest allegiance to Himself, to hide the Father’s face, or to close the portals of the Father’s home. Belief in all these miracles (meaning the miracles recorded in the New Testament) and in these angelic messengers, and in these wonderful births was impossible, unless there had been first in men’s minds belief in an absent God, in a God who was *not* immediately and constantly present in the world and among men. The very idea of Incarnation itself, which means Deity coming from Heaven and dwelling in an individual man for some years implies a belief that God does not, nor ever did, dwell in the hearts of all men. This belief and a belief in other miracles are not peculiar to Christianity; they are common to all the religions of the world. The Brahmins have their nine incarnations of Vishnu, which, in their way, are splendid conceptions of Divine love and sympathy.”

As regards the charge contained in the 26th article of charge the following extract from p. 35 will suffice:—“But the Fatherhood of God strikes more deeply at the prevailing views than this. The common notion about the coming of a God into the world once, and His expected return to judge the

world, turns entirely upon the belief in an absent God. It takes its rise in unbelief. These notions of a God coming to dwell amongst men in human form after thousands of years' absence from them, then departing, after a short life on earth, and not returning for thousands of years more, only spring out of absolute infidelity. Men must first be convinced that God is away from them before they can adopt the idea that God has sent some one to visit them. And if that one Man who came was Very God of Very God in a sense in which all other men are not, His going away again after a short human lifetime proves that absence still more painfully; and it cannot be wondered at that His return to earth should be looked for and longed for with the most passionate eagerness of the soul. If God could leave the long ages of human life deserted by Him before the coming of Christ, and then, after the little space of thirty-three years, could leave mankind again for thousands of years more in the same desolate desertion, then He is not the Father of men, and we might then question if He is even our Friend."

Indeed, the author in an extract contained in p 24 (articles of charge, No. 9) candidly states, "I found that I could not hold to the true Fatherhood of God if I did not give up some of the doctrines of so-called Christianity. The doctrines of mediation, intercession, atonement, isolated incarnation, and the expected return of Jesus to earth are all, more or less, opposed to the perfect harmony and simplicity of the love of God as a Father."

As regards the 10th charge contained in the 27th article of the charge against the appellant, being the last of the general class relating to the incarnation and Godhead of Christ, we think it is proved by the following passage, "Take away (that is, from the Book of Common Prayer) what we can most heartily join in, and the greater part, as well as the most important part, of the Service would be expunged. For the sake of this, then, we may well bear for a time with the blemishes, weaknesses, and minor superstitions which the Church of Rome bequeathed to us when we parted company at the last Reformation. We need not hesitate at the repetition of any creed which makes us say as its first words, 'I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth, and of all things visible and invisible.' Any clause added thereto which seems to weaken or to disguise the first grand utterance may well be tolerated, considering the changing times in which we live, for the sake of the cardinal, and central and most vital principle upon which all the rest is or is supposed to be based."

The four remaining charges against the appellant constitute the last general class of his alleged errors, viz. his depraving of Scripture; and they are as follows —That the appellant has promulgated, in derogation and depraving of Holy Scripture, the doctrine that the revelation of the knowledge of God by means of any book is impossible; that all true knowledge of God comes directly from the law of God written in men's hearts; that all knowledge of God comes only from men's own sense of what He requires them to do; and that the only true revelation possible by God to man is through the sense of God's presence, and is originated in the heart of man independently of God's written Word (31st article of charge).—

That he has asserted that in God's Word written, Holy Scriptures, and Holy Writ, there are found manifest, palpable, and irreconcilable contradictions, and many places which cannot be explained but so that they be repugnant to others (32nd article of charge);—

That he has asserted, in derogation and depraving of Holy Scripture, that the authority of the Gospel according to St. John is doubtful, and that the said Gospel ought not to be applied to establish any doctrine, and that whole chapters of the said Gospel are crowded with passages which represent Jesus Christ as speaking words which He never could have spoken, and which, if spoken, would not have been believed (33rd article of charge),

That he has asserted that the Gospel according to St. John contains passages which can only be expounded so that they be repugnant to each other or to other places of God's Word written, or Holy Scripture, and that the character of our Lord Jesus Christ as there set forth is quite irreconcilable with the idea of His being a Teacher sent from God, and is entirely different from the character of the Christ of the other Gospels (34th article of charge).

The first, second, and fourth of the offences alleged in the last-mentioned articles of charge are stated to contravene the 6th and 20th Articles of Religion, and the 13th to contravene the 6th Article of Religion; and each of the said offences is also charged to be an assertion of doctrine inconsistent with certain portions of the Book of Common Prayer, set forth in the subsequent articles of charge.

The 6th Article of Religion lays it down that there never was any doubt in the Church of the authority of the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments, and that the Church applies them to establish doctrine. Whilst the 20th Article of Religion declares "that it is not lawful for the Church to ordain any thing that is contrary to God's Word written, nor may it so expound one portion of Scripture that it be repugnant to another."

Now it is very important upon this head of the inquiry to consider the Judgment delivered by Lord Westbury in the case of "*Essays and Reviews*" (*Williams v. the Bishop of Salisbury*, and *Wilson v. Fendall*. 2 Moore, P.C. Cases, New Series, p. 426.)

In considering one of the charges against Dr. Williams in that case the Judgment states the case thus:—"The words that the Bible is 'an expression of devout reason, and therefore to be read with reason in freedom,' are treated in the charge as equivalent to these words—The Bible is the composition or work of devout or pious men, and nothing more; but such a meaning ought not to be ascribed to the words of a writer who, a few lines farther on, has plainly affirmed that the Holy Spirit dwelt in the sacred writers of the Bible. This context enables us to say that the words, 'an expression of devout reason, and, therefore, to be read with reason in freedom,' ought not to be taken in the sense ascribed to them by the accusation. In like manner we deem it unnecessary to put any interpretation on the words, 'written voice of the congregation,' inasmuch as we are satisfied that whatever may be the meaning of the passages included in this article, they do not, taken collectively, warrant the charge which has been made that Dr. Williams has maintained the Bible not to be the Word of God, nor the rule of faith."

The Judgment therefore is express in saying that the ground for regarding the statements of Dr. Williams as not exceeding the just limits allowed by the Articles of Religion was, that he did not state the Bible to be the composition of devout men, and nothing more. So, in considering the charge against Mr. Wilson, the following passage occurs (p. 429):—"In the 8th article of charge an extract of some length is made from Mr. Wilson's Essay, and the accusation is, that in the passage extracted, Mr. Wilson has declared

and affirmed in effect that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament were not written under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and that they were not necessarily at all, and certainly not in parts, the Word of God, and then reference is made to the 6th and 20th Articles of Religion, to part of the Nicene Creed, and to a passage in the Ordination of Priests in the Book of Common Prayer. This charge, therefore, involves the proposition,—that it is a contradiction of the doctrine laid down in the 6th and 20th Articles of Religion, in the Nicene Creed, and in the Ordination Service of Priests, to affirm that any part of the canonical books of the Old or New Testament, upon any subject whatever, however unconnected with religious faith or moral duty, was not written under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit.”

Guided by the Judgment we have thus referred to, we do not think the 11th charge contained in the 31st article of charge is so made out by the extract given from the appellant's work as to justify us in regarding that article of charge as established. The appellant asserts, indeed, at the end of a long passage, extracted in page 41, that all knowledge of God can only come from our own deep sense of what He requires us to do; and these words are associated with much disparagement of the Bible. But it is possible to interpret these words as meaning that the Bible itself should be of no effect in imparting a knowledge of God if that deep sense of what He requires us to do were absent. A sense in which the expression would be allowable, and, following the example set by the Judgment in the case of the Essays and Reviews, we think this interpretation in a *quasi*-criminal proceeding should prevail.

As regards the remaining charges contained in the following articles of charge, whatever force may be given to the word “authority” in the 6th Article of Religion “as applied to the canonical books of the Old and New Testament,” we are of opinion that, in order that the books (which are enumerated) should have any authority at all, it is not consistent with that Article of Religion for any private clergyman, of his own mere will, not founding himself upon any critical inquiry, but simply upon his own taste and judgment, to assert that whole passages of such canonical books are without any authority whatever, as being contrary to the teaching of Christ, as contained in others of the canonical books. We think that no private clergyman can do that which the whole Church is by the 20th Article declared to be incompetent to do, viz. expound one part of Scripture in a manner repugnant to another, and we need not go through the painful task of citing the numerous passages in the extracts where this is done by the appellant. We find whole chapters of the Gospel of St. John declared by the appellant on his own simple assertion, to be irreconcilable with the other Gospels, not on points unconnected with “religious faith and duty,” to use the words of the Judgment in the case of the “Essays and Reviews,” but in the most essential manner connected with both, and again, whole passages declared to be spurious on no other ground than that they do not approve themselves to the appellant's taste. We can entertain no doubt then that the charges contained in the 32nd, 33rd, and 34th articles of charge are abundantly established.

We have now fulfilled the duty of examining minutely the articles of charge exhibited against the appellant. We have not been unmindful of the latitude wisely allowed by the Articles of Religion to the clergy, so as to embrace all who hold one common faith. The mysterious nature of many

of the subjects associated with the cardinal points of this faith, must of necessity occasion great diversity of opinion, and it has not been attempted by the Articles to close all discussion, or to guard against varied interpretations of Scripture with reference even to cardinal articles of faith, so that these articles are themselves plainly admitted, in some sense or other, according to a reasonable construction, or according even to a doubtful, but not delusive construction. Neither have we omitted to notice the previous decisions of the Ecclesiastical Courts, and especially the judgments of this tribunal, by which interpretations of the Articles of Religion which by any reasonable allowance for the variety of human opinion can be reconciled with their language, have been held to be consistent with a due obedience to the laws ecclesiastical, even though the interpretation in question might not be that which the tribunal itself would have assigned to the Article.

We have also had careful regard to the explanations given by the appellant himself in Court of those of his writings from which the extracts contained in the articles of charge have been taken, in order to see whether the extracts convey to the mind the advised and definite opinions of the author, or whether their meaning can be modified by the context in a sense more consistent with the Articles of Religion, but we cannot find any indication of such being the case.

We think that the extracts deliberately exhibit the opinions of the appellant, by which the Articles of Religion, with reference to original sin, the sacrifice and suffering of Christ, the Son of God, both God and man, to reconcile His Father to man, the Incarnation and Godhead of the Son, His return to judge the world, the doctrine of the Trinity, are plainly contradicted and impugned, and the Holy Scriptures are as plainly denied their legitimate authority, even on points essential both to faith and duty, by the process of denying their genuineness, not on any critical grounds, but avowedly because they contradict the appellant's private judgment.

We have not, in this our decision, referred to any of the Formularies of the Church other than the Articles of Religion. We have been mindful of the authorities, which have held that pious expressions of devotion are not to be taken as binding declarations of doctrine. But the appellant will, we think, himself feel how impossible it is that any society whatever of worshippers can be held together without some fundamental points of agreement, or can together worship a Being in whom they have no common faith. He himself seems to have experienced the difficulty in the remarkable passages extracted in page 42 of the Appendix, with reference to prayer in the name of Jesus Christ.

The whole of the Formularies of the Church, and of its devotion, are based on the faith in one God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. In the daily services of the Church, both morning and evening, glory is ascribed at the end of each Psalm to this one God in Trinity, naming each person of the Godhead separately. Prayer constantly concludes with a reference to the mediation of Jesus Christ. Direct prayer is addressed to Jesus Christ in daily service, morning and evening by the short prayer of "Christ, have mercy upon us." In the daily Morning Prayer, throughout a great portion of the *Te Deum*, prayer is made to the Son; and three times in a week, in the Litany, there is direct prayer addressed both to the Son and to the Holy Ghost, as well as to the Holy Trinity. In fact, a large portion of the Litany is addressed to the Son directly. It is not surprising, then, that there should be Articles distinctly supporting devotions, so fully impressed with

in the intercession and power of the Son who is thus invoked. And it would be as contrary to morality as to law to direct the professors of any religion daily to offer prayer to One in whose divine power they have no faith, or to address as God One whom they believed to be only man.

The appellant, in his address to us, relied much on the absence of direct verbal contradiction in his writings to the words of the Articles of Religion, and asserted that, inasmuch as the Articles could not be all reconciled with each other, he might properly dwell on one view of an Article, which, from the inconsistent character of the Articles, would be opposed to the construction of another Article. The mode in which the appellant constantly misrepresents and caricatures the opinions from which he differs, no doubt accounts for his thus attributing inconsistency to statements of doctrine which he has misunderstood.

We are, on a perusal of the appellant's writings, driven to the conclusion, not removed by his arguments, that the appellant advisedly rejects the doctrines on the profession of which alone he was admitted to the position of a Minister of the Church. He disclaims all wish to reconsider his avowed and published opinions, and does not desire an opportunity of retracting any of his opinions. We are bound, therefore, to advise her Majesty that his appeal against the admission of the Articles should be dismissed with costs, and that, on the merits of the whole case, sentence of deprivation should be pronounced against the appellant, and that he should be condemned in the costs of the suit.

In pronouncing this decision their Lordships have assumed that the appellant adheres to the intimation, made by him on the conclusion of the argument, that he does not desire an opportunity of retracting the opinions which have now been condemned, but their Lordships are, nevertheless, unwilling to proceed to the last step of their duty if he do, within a week from this date, expressly and unreservedly retract the several errors of which he has been convicted.

Their Lordships would have followed the precedent afforded by Mr. Heath's case if the appellant had been present, and would have required his immediate decision, but they have been informed that Mr. Voysey's absence is occasioned by a sufficient reason.

II.

THE PURCHAS CASE.

THE Judgment of the Privy Council, in the Appeal of Hebbert *v.* Purchas, is another of the most important ecclesiastical judgments of modern times, affecting as it does the legality of the principal Ritualistic acts and observances which have lately become of frequent use in many English Churches. Mr. Purchas was Perpetual Curate of St. James's Church at Brighton. The articles of charge, which were the subject of appeal, were as follows:—

1. That by an Act of Parliament passed in a Session of Parliament holden in the 1st year of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, chapter 2, and by another Act of Parliament passed in a Session of Parliament holden in the 13th and 14th years of the reign of King Charles II, chapter 4, and by another Act of Parliament passed in a Session of Parliament holden in the 28th and 29th

years of the Queen, chapter 122, and by the 14th, 36th, and 38th of the Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical treated upon by the Bishop of London, President of the Convocation for the province of Canterbury, and the rest of the Bishops and Clergy of the said province, and agreed upon, with the licence of his Majesty King James I., in their Synod, begun at London in the year of our Lord 1603, and ratified by his said Majesty's Letters Patent under the Great Seal of England, all Clerks and Ministers in Holy Orders are, among other things, bound to say and use the Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies of the Church, according to the use of the United Church of England and Ireland, and that any Clerk or Minister in Holy Orders offending against the said Statute Law, Constitutions, and Canons, ought to be punished according to the gravity of his offence and the exigencies of the law

II. That by the Laws, Statutes, Constitutions, and Canons Ecclesiastical of this Realm, and more particularly by or by virtue of the Statutes 1st Elizabeth, chapter 2, and 13th and 14th Charles II., chapter 4, and of the 58th Canon of the Constitutions and Canons Ecclesiastical in the last preceding article mentioned, every Minister of the Church in England, when saying the Public Prayers, or administering the Sacraments, or other rites of the Church, in parish churches, and other churches and chapels in England, is required to wear a decent and comely surplice with sleeves, with such hood as by the orders of their Universities are agreeable to their degrees, and being not Graduates, they are permitted to wear upon their surplices a decent tippet of black, but not of silk, instead of hoods; but that it is not lawful for such Ministers, or for any of them, when so officiating in parish churches, other churches or chapels in England, at the Public Prayers, or when ministering the Sacraments or other rites of the Church, to wear the following vestments, or any of them, namely, a cope, a chasuble, an alb with patches called apparels, tippets of a circular form on the shoulders, gold stoles, coloured stoles, a dalmatic, a tunic or a tunicle, a stole crosswise, that is, crossed over the breast, or a cap or covering for the head called a biretta.

III. That you, the said Rev. John Purchas, have been for many years past, and now are, a Clerk in Holy Orders of the United Church of England and Ireland, and that on the 27th day of June, in the year 1866, you were licensed or admitted as Perpetual Curate, or Minister, of St. James's Church or Chapel at Brighton, in the county of Sussex, and diocese of Chichester, and province of Canterbury.

XVI. That you, the said Rev. John Purchas, in the said Church or Chapel of St. James's, Brighton, aforesaid, on Whit Sunday, May the 16th, 1869, administered wine mixed with water instead of wine to the Communicants at the Lord's Supper.

XVII. That you, the said Rev. John Purchas, in the said Church or Chapel of St. James's, Brighton, aforesaid, on divers occasions (to wit, on Sunday, February the 7th, 1869; on Ash Wednesday, February the 10th, 1869; on Sunday, February the 28th, 1869; on Sunday, March the 14th, 1869; on Sunday, March the 21st, 1869; on Easter Sunday, March the 28th, 1869), during the Prayer of Consecration in the Order of the Administration of the Holy Communion, elevated the paten or one of the wafers on the Communion Table, for the Holy Communion, above your head, and permitted and sanctioned such elevation by the other offici-

Ministers, and took into your hands the cup, and elevated it above your head during the Prayer of Consecration aforesaid, and permitted and sanctioned the cup to be so taken and elevated, as aforesaid, by the other officiating Ministers; and that you also, during such Prayer of Consecration, knelt or prostrated yourself, and sanctioned such kneeling or prostrating by the other officiating Ministers; and that you also, during the whole of such Prayer of Consecration, stood at the middle of that side of the holy table, which, if the said holy table stood at the east end of the said church or chapel (the said table in St. James's Chapel, in fact, standing at the west end thereof, would be the west side of such table, in such wise that you then stood between the people and the said holy table, with your back to the people, so that the people could not see you break the bread or take the cup into your hand.

XX. That you, the said Rev. John Purchas, in the said Church or Chapel of St. James's, Brighton, aforesaid, on divers occasions (to wit, on Sunday, January the 31st, 1869, Sunday, February the 7th, 1869; Monday, March the 15th, 1869; on Sunday, March the 21st, 1869; on Easter Sunday, March the 28th, 1869; and Whit Sunday, May the 16th, 1869), in the administration of the Holy Communion, used wafer bread (being bread made in the special shape and fashion of circular wafers) instead of bread such as is usual to be eaten, and did administer the same to the communicants, that is to say, one such wafer to each of them.

XXV. That you, the said Rev. John Purchas, in the said Church or Chapel of St. James's, Brighton, aforesaid, on Sunday, December the 27th, 1868, on Palm Sunday, 1869; and on Whit Sunday, May the 16th, 1869, caused holy water, or water previously blessed or consecrated, to be poured into divers receptacles for the same in and about the said church, in order that the same might be used by persons of the congregation before and during the time of Divine Service, by way of ceremonial application thereof; and yourself used the same, or caused or permitted the same to be used by others.

XXXVI. That you, the said Rev. John Purchas, in the said Church or Chapel of St. James's, Brighton, aforesaid, on several occasions (to wit, Sunday morning, November the 1st, 1868, Sunday morning, November the 5th, 1868, Sunday morning, January the 17th, 1869, Sunday morning January the 31st, 1869; Sunday morning, February the 7th, 1869, Sunday morning, February the 28th, 1869; Sunday Morning, March the 14th, 1869; Monday morning, March the 15th, 1869; and Easter Sunday morning, March the 28th, 1869), used and wore a vestment called a chasuble while officiating in the Communion Service and in the administration of the Holy Communion, and on the said days and times, while present in the said church and yourself officiating, and while responsible, as Perpetual Curate or Minister thereof, for the due performance of Divine Service therein, sanctioned and authorized the wearing of a chasuble by other Clergymen while also officiating in the Communion Service and in the administration of the Holy Communion in the said church or chapel.

XXXVIII. That you, the said Rev. John Purchas, in the said Church or Chapel of St. James's, Brighton, aforesaid, on divers occasions (to wit, on Sunday, November the 8th 1868; on Sunday, January the 17th, 1869, and other times) at Evening Prayer wore a scarlet stole embroidered with cross over your surplice, and at Morning Service, on Tuesday, February the 2nd, 1869, wore a gold stole over a garment called an alb, and have usually within

two years last past worn a stole of some colour during Divine Service in your said church or chapel. That on divers occasions (to wit, on Sunday, January the 17th, 1869, Sunday, February the 28th, 1869, and other times within two years last past) you caused or suffered certain of the clergy officiating or assisting at the Communion Service, in your presence, in the said church or chapel, to wear certain other vestments (to wit, dalmatics, tunics or tunicles, and albs) instead of surplices, and you yourself also, at such times, when officiating in the Communion Services, have worn a certain vestment (to wit, an alb) instead of a surplice, and you yourself also then wore, and caused or suffered to be worn by other officiating Clergy, a girdle, amice, and maniple; and you also on divers occasions (to wit, on Sunday, February the 28th, 1869, and on divers other days within two years last past) wore, and caused or suffered certain of the other clergy officiating or assisting at the Communion Service to wear, a stole crosswise, that is to say, crossed over the breast, and you also wore or bore in your hand, and caused or suffered to be worn or borne in the hand in your presence by other officiating Clergy in the said Church or Chapel on divers occasions (to wit, on Sunday, February the 28th, 1869, and on Easter Sunday, 1869, and Whit Sunday, May the 16th, 1869, and other times within two years last past) a certain cap or covering for the head called a biretta.

The Dean of the Arches Court of Canterbury decided that, for ministers below the order of bishops, the cope, or chasuble, surplice, alb, and tunicle was the proper vestment for the celebrating or assisting Ministers at the Holy Communion; but that in all other services the surplice only should be worn. The learned Judge declined to pronounce that the respondent had offended in respect of the other charges. From so much of this judgment the appeal was brought. The hearing of the appeal and the arguments of counsel for the promoter occupied several days, and an immense number of authorities were referred to.

The result of the Judgment of the Judicial Committee may be summed up as follows.—The use of what are known as “Eucharistic vestments” is forbidden except the cope, which is to be worn in ministering the Holy Communion on high feast days in cathedrals or collegiate churches, as provided by the 24th Canon, and that the surplice is the proper vestment at all other administrations. The use of mixed chalice and wafer bread is declared to be illegal. The proper position of the officiating minister at the administration of the Holy Communion is defined to be at the north end of the table, when the table is at the east end of his church, where he is to stand during the Prayer of Consecration and not to turn his back on the congregation, in order that the people may see him break the bread and take the cup into his hands.

The evidence as to the use of consecrated water appeared to the Committee to be insufficient; no judgment was therefore given upon that article of appeal. The Committee also declined to pronounce that Mr Purchas had offended by the use of a “biretta” carried in his hand during divine worship, but not worn in church.

The Judgment itself, delivered by the Lord Chancellor on the 23rd February, 1871—present, the Lord Chancellor (Lord Hatherley), the Archbishop of York (Dr. Thomson), the Bishop of London (Dr. Jackson), and Lord Chelmsford—was as follows:—

In this case, which comes to us from the Arches Court of Canterbury, the learned Judge of that Court has directed a monition to issue to the Rev. John

Purchas as to several matters and things complained of by the promoter, and the defendant has not appealed. But as to certain charges contained in the 16th, 17th, 20th, 25th, 36th, and 38th articles of charge, the learned Judge has refused or omitted to direct a motion to issue against the defendant, and to condemn him in the costs of these articles, and against the decision upon these articles the promoter has appealed.

The substitution of Henry Herbert as promoter, for the purpose of this appeal, for Charles James Elphinstone, the promoter in the Court below, since deceased, has been allowed by a former judgment of this Committee.

The Rev. John Purchas, the respondent, has not appeared, and the Committee has not had the assistance of the argument of counsel on his behalf.

The charges which are the subject of this appeal are that the respondent has offended against the Statute Law, and the Constitutions, and Canons Ecclesiastical by administering wine mixed with water, instead of wine, to the communicants, as pleaded in the 16th article: and by standing with his back to the people, between the people and the holy table, whilst reading the Prayer of Consecration in the Holy Communion, as pleaded in the 17th article; and by the use of wafer bread instead of bread such as is usual to be eaten, in the administration of the Holy Communion, as pleaded in the 20th article; and by causing holy water, or water previously blessed or consecrated, to be poured into divers receptacles for the same in the said church, in order that the same might be used by persons in the congregation, or by causing or permitting the same to be used by others, as pleaded in the 25th article; and by himself wearing and sanctioning and authorizing the wearing by other officiating Ministers, whilst officiating in the Communion Service, and in the administration of the Holy Communion in the said church, a vestment called a chasuble, as pleaded in the 36th article; and by himself wearing, and causing or suffering to be worn by other officiating clergy, when officiating in the Communion Service in the said Church, certain other vestments called dalmatics, tunics or tunicles, and albs, and by himself wearing, carrying, or causing or suffering other officiating clergy in the same church to wear or bear in their hand, a certain cap called a biretta, during Divine Service, as pleaded in the 38th article.

We find it convenient to adopt the order followed by the learned Dean of the Arches, and to examine first the charge of wearing, and causing to be worn, a chasuble, tunics or tunicles, and albs, in the celebration of the Holy Communion.

It is necessary to review shortly the history of the Rubric, usually known as the "Ornaments-Rubric," which governs this question.

The First Prayer Book of King Edward VI. (1549) contains the following Rubric at the beginning of the Communion Office:—

"Upon the day and at the time appointed for the ministration of the Holy Communion, the priest that shall execute the holy ministry shall put upon him the vesture appointed for that ministration, that is to say, a white alb, plain, with a vestment or cope, and where there be many priests or deacons, then so many shall be ready to help the priest in the ministration as shall be required, and shall have upon them likewise the vestures appointed for their ministry, that is to say, albs with tunicles."

In the second Prayer Book of Edward VI. (1552) this was altered, and it was ordered that the minister "shall use neither albe, vestment, nor cope, but being archbishop or bishop he shall have and wear a rochet, and being a priest or deacon he shall have and wear a surplice only."

The Prayer Book of Elizabeth (A.D. 1559) provided that "the minister at the time of the communion, and at all other times of his ministration, shall use such ornaments in the church as were in use by authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI., according to the Act of Parliament set in the beginning of this book."

This Committee has already decided (*Liddell v. Westerton*), that the words "by authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI." refer to the first Prayer Book of King Edward VI.

The Act of Parliament set in the beginning of Elizabeth's book is Queen Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity, and the 25th clause of that Act contains a proviso, "that such ornaments of the Church and the ministers thereof shall be retained and be in use, as was in this Church of England by authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI. until other order shall be therein taken by the authority of the Queen's Majesty, with the advice of the Commissioners as appointed under the Great Seal of England, for Causes Ecclesiastical, or of the Metropolitan of this Realm."

The Prayer Book, therefore, refers to the Act, and the Act clearly contemplated further directions to be given by the Queen, with the advice of Commissioners or of the Metropolitan. It was not, apparently, thought desirable to effect an immediate outward change of ceremonies, although the adoption of the second Prayer Book of Edward VI. in lieu of the first, had effected a great change in the very substance of the Communion Service, with which the theory of the peculiar vestments (the alb and chasuble) was closely connected.

The rubric and the proviso together seem to restore for the present the ornaments of the Minister which the second Prayer Book of King Edward had taken away. But Sandys, afterwards Archbishop of York, who assisted at the revision of the Prayer Book, gives to Archbishop Parker a different suggestion:—"Our gloss upon this text," he says, "is, that we shall not be forced to use them (the ornaments), but that others in the meantime shall not convey them away, but that they shall remain for the Queen." (*Burnet's Reformation*, vol. II., *Records*, p. 332.) The injunctions of Elizabeth appeared in the same year, 1559, and one of them orders that "the churchwardens of every parish shall deliver unto the visitors the inventories of vestments, copes, and other ornaments, plate, books, and specially of grails, couchers, legends, processionals, hymnals, manuals, portasses, and such like appertaining to the Church." (*Cardwell, Doc. Annals*, I. 228.) Commissioners began to carry out these injunctions in the same year. One of their Returns is in the Record Office (*Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1547—1580*, p. 148), which shows that they chiefly occupied themselves in taking inventories of Church ornaments and of the service books in use.

In the year 1564 appeared the Advertisements of Elizabeth. They make order for the vesture of the minister in these words:—"In the ministration of the Holy Communion now in cathedral and collegiate churches, the principal minister shall use a cope, with gospeler and epistoler agreeably; and at all other prayers to be said at the said Communion Table to use no copes, but surplices. That every minister saying any public prayers or ministering the Sacraments or other rites of the Church, shall wear a comely surplice with sleeves, to be provided at the charge of the parish." (*Cardwell, Doc. Annals*, I. 326.)

These Advertisements were very actively enforced within a few years of their publication. An inventory of the ornaments of 150 parishes in the diocese of Lincoln, A.D. 1565-66, has been published by Mr. Edward Peacock; and it shows that the chasubles or vestments and the albs were systematically defaced, destroyed, or put to other uses, and a precise account was rendered of the mode of their destruction. Proceedings took place under Commissions in Lancashire in 1565 and 1570; in Carlisle in 1573 and following years, when "vestments seem to have disappeared altogether." (Rev J. Raine, "Vestments," London, 1866) There is no reason to doubt that all through the country commissions were issued to enforce the observance of the Advertisements within a few years after they were drawn up.

The Visitation Articles of the Archbishops and Bishops about this time show that the operation of the Advertisements had been rapid and complete. Archbishop Grindal, in 1571, inquires, "whether all vestments, albs, tunicles, stoles, phanons, pixes, paxes, hand-bells, sacring-bells, censers, crismatories, crosses, candlesticks, holy water stocks, images, and such other reliques and monuments of superstition and idolatrie be utterly defaced, broken, and destroyed." (2nd Report, Ritual Commission, p. 408*a*) Archbishop Parker in 1575 asks, "in the time of celebration of dyvne service, whether they wear surplices" (2 Ritual Commission, p. 416*a*) Aylmer, Bishop of London, uses the same form of question as Archbishop Grindal (Ibid p. 418*b*). Sandys, Archbishop of York, inquired in 1578 "whether your parson, vicar, or curate, at all times in saying the Common Prayer upon Sundays and holydays, and in administering of the Sacrament doth use and retain the surplice, yea or nay." (Ibid. p. 422*a*)

Upon the whole there is abundant evidence that within a few years after the Advertisements were issued the vestments in the Mass entirely disappeared. It is true that for some years after the appearance of the Advertisements great reluctance was exhibited by the Puritan party to the use of the surplice, and in the struggle against the use, they sometimes asserted that, if the surplice were insisted upon, then, by virtue of the Rubric and Act of Parliament, the other vestments mentioned in the first Prayer Book of Edward VI should also be used.

In a somewhat rare tract, printed in the reign of James I., 1605, and addressed to the Bishop of Worcester, defending "the not exact use of the Authorized Book of Common Prayer," the writer (p. 34) argues that no such order was made by the Queen as was directed by the Act of Parliament, yet he even admits that the Metropolitan, "on the Queen's mandative letters that some order might be taken, had conference and communication, and at the last, by assent and consent of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, did think such orders as were specified in the Advertisements meet and convenient to be used and followed" (p. 36); but he asserts that they were of no value, since the "Queen's assent was not yielded."

This last proposition can hardly be maintained; for if the Queen's mandative letter preceded the compilation of the Advertisements, and if, as it appears abundantly, they were afterwards enforced as by her authority, her assent must be presumed. It appears probable that the Queen hesitated before the Advertisements were thus enforced, as to which see a remarkable letter from the Archbishop to Cecil, on the 28th March, 1566, cited by Mr. Perry in his book on "Lawful Church Ornaments" (p. 209), from the

Parker Correspondence, on which Mr. Perry remarks, "it would seem that the Archbishop's application had at length some success, for immediately afterwards he sent his letter to the Bishop of London for conformity." and in the letter to the Bishop he requests him "to transmit the Book of Advertisements to the other Suffragans of the Province." But it has been said the contemporaneous evidence as to the abolition of all vestments obnoxious to the Puritan party (other than the surplice, hood, and tippet, and the square cap) is abundant.

In a scarce book, called "A Part of a Register," in which is a considerable number of documents collected by those who objected to Church Ritual, the complaint is uniformly against copes and surplices. Thus, in a letter by A. G., 1570, page 13, he complains of "crossing, toping, and surplessing." A report of the examination of Smith, Nixon, and others before the Lord Mayor, the Bishop of London, and other Commissioners, 1567, page 28, describes Hawkins, one of the accused, as saying, "Surplesses and copes be superstitious and idolatrous." Ireland, another of them (page 32), says to the Bishop, "But you go like one of the Mass priests still," to which the Bishop replies, "*You see me wear a cope or a surpless at Paul's. I had rather minister without these things, but for order's sake and for obedience to the Prince.*"

In another of these documents, called "A View of Antichrist, His Laws and Ceremonies," there is a careful enumeration of ornaments complained of as Popish, not mentioning alb nor chasuble, but (page 63) there is mention of "the cap, the tippet, the surplice for small churches, the cope for great churches, furred hoods in summer for the great doctors, silken hoods in their quiers upon a surpleese, and the grey amise with the catted tails." This mention of the amise is the only notice in the many tracts collected in the Register of any specific vestment other than the surplice and cope being worn. But in the same book is contained, "A Letter by Master Robert Johnson to Master Edwin Sandys (1573)," in which, at page 104, he says, "You must yield some reason why the tippet is commended and the stole forbidden; why the vestment is put away and the cope retained, why the alb is laid aside and the surplice is used; or why the chalice is forbidden in the Bishop of Canterbury's Articles or the grey amice by the Canon more than the rest, why have they offended," &c. Edward Dering (1593), in another tract in the same book, speaks of the grey amice having been specially forbidden in the "Book of the Discipline of the Church of England." He goes on to say, that other vestments, equally superstitious, are used; and in a passage immediately before this he asks, "how he can subscribe to ceremonies in cathedral churches, where they have the priest, dean, and subdean in copes and vestments all as before;" but that he is alluding in this to the cope and surplice is plain, both from the before cited statement of the Bishop of London to Hawkins, and from the question in Johnson's tract, "Why the vestment is put away and the cope retained, the alb laid aside and the surplice in use;" and the enumeration of Popish ornaments in the "View of Antichrist."

Now all the tracts above cited are dated within ten years after the date of the Advertisements, and the complaints so bitterly made as to the cope and surplice would certainly have extended to the alb and chasuble had they not then ceased to exist.

In the correspondence with foreign Reformers, called the "Zurich Letters,"

the controversy is treated as having become confined to the cope and surplice.

At the Hampton Court Conference the Puritans objected to the surplice, as "a kind of garment which the priests of Isis used to wear." (Cardwell, *Conferences*, p. 200) There was evidently no other vestment in use to which they could object. The revised Prayer Book, issued soon after, retained the Ornaments-Rubric in the same form as the Prayer Book of Queen Elizabeth. The Canons of 1603-4 enacted by both Convocations, and ratified by the King's consent, sanctioned the use of this Prayer Book. But whilst thus implicitly sanctioning the Ornaments-Rubric, the Canons also provide specially for the vesture of the minister. Canon 24 directs the use of a "decent cope" for the principal minister in the Holy Communion in cathedrals and collegiate churches "according to the Advertisements published anno 7 Elizabeth;" and Canon 58 directs that "every minister saying the public prayers or ministering the Sacraments or other rites of the Church, shall use a decent and comely surplice with sleeves, to be provided at the charge of the parish."

Their Lordships think it needless to adduce authorities to show that there was no attempt to revive or use the chasuble, alb, and tunicle, between the years 1604 and 1662.

The Ornaments-Rubric of 1662 is as follows:—"And here it is to be noted that such ornaments of the church and the minister thereof at all times of their ministrations, shall be retained and be in use as were in this Church of England by the authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI." The form of this Rubric is different from that of the preceding Prayer Book, and follows, for the most part, the wording of the proviso of the Act of Queen Elizabeth.

The learned judge in the Court below, assumes (*Appendix*, p. 74) that the Puritan party at the Savoy Conference, objected to *this* Rubric: whereas it was the Rubric of James that they were discussing. Upon that, the Puritans observed that, "Inasmuch as this Rubric seemeth to bring back the cope, alb, and other vestments forbidden by the Common Prayer Book, 5 & 6 Edward VI., and so for reasons alleged against ceremonies under our eighteenth general exception, we deem it may be wholly left out." The Rubric had been in force for nearly sixty years, and they do not allege that the vestments had been brought back; nor would a total omission of the Rubric have been a protection against them. The Bishops in their answer show that they understand the surplice to be in question, and not the vestments. (*Cardwell, Conferences*, 314, 345, 351). But the learned judge through this oversight has overlooked the most important part of the proceedings. The Bishops determined that the Rubric "should continue as it is." But after this, they did, in fact, recast it entirely. It must not be assumed that alterations made under such circumstances were made without thought, and are of no importance. The Rubric had directed the minister to "use at the time of the Communion, and at all other times of his ministrations," the ornaments in question. The statute of Elizabeth did not direct such use nor refer to any special times of ministration, but it ordered simply the retaining of the ornaments till further order made by the Queen. The Bishops threw aside the form of the old Rubric and adopted that of the statute of Elizabeth, but added the words "at all times of their ministration" without the words which had in all former Rubrics distinguished the Holy Communion from other ministrations; a mode

of expression more suitable to a state of things wherein the vestments for all ministrations had become the same. The change also brought in the word "retained," which, it has been argued, would not include things already obsolete. Whatever be the force of these two arguments, the fact is clear that the Puritans objected to a Rubric differing from this, and that after their objections, the Rubric was recast, and brought into its present form.

With regard to the suggestion attributed to the House of Lords, "whether the Rubric should not be mended where all vestments in time of divine service are now commanded which were used by Edward VI." (Cardwell, *Conferences*, p. 247), the learned judge has overlooked the fact that this applies to the earlier rubric; and the suggestion did not emanate from the House of Lords, nor was it ever adopted by that body. And the learned judge omits to observe that the Rubric of James, which was objected to, was amended after the suggestion.

From the passing of the Act of Uniformity there is abundant evidence to show that the vestments in question were not used at all. Their Lordships may refer to the various Visitation Articles published in the Second Report of the Ritual Commission and elsewhere, as showing that the surplice alone was to be used, and that deviations from that rule were on the side of defect, and not in the direction of returning to the vestments of the Mass. Some of these Articles were published by Bishop Cosin and others who took part in the revision of the Prayer Book. In the Sixth Article Bishop Cosin inquires "Have you a large and decent surplice (one or more) for the minister to wear at all times of his publick ministration in the church?" (2nd Ritual Commission, 601*a*). This repetition of the words "at all times of his ministration," the exact words of the Rubric, is very significant as a contemporaneous exposition of it by one of its framers.

These, then, are the leading historical facts with which we have to deal in the difficult task of construing the Rubric of Ornaments. The vestment or cope, alb, and tunicle were ordered by the first Prayer Book of Edward VI. They were abolished by the Prayer Book of 1552, and the surplice was substituted. They were provisionally restored by the statute of Elizabeth, and by her Prayer Book of 1559. But the injunctions and the Advertisements of Elizabeth established a new order within a few years from the passing of the statute, under which chasuble, alb, and tunicle disappeared. The canons of 1603-4, adopting anew the reference to the Rubric of Edward VI., sanctioned in express terms all that the Advertisements had done in the matter of the vestments, and ordered the surplice only to be used in parish churches. The revisers of our present Prayer Book in 1662, under another form of words, repeated the reference to the second year of Edward VI., and they did so advisedly, after attention had been called to the possibility of a return to the vestments.

The authority of the Advertisements has been questioned on the ground that it has never been shown that they received the assent of the Queen. Supposing, for the sake of argument, that the Advertisements did not receive the official assent of the Queen, but were acted upon under a number of Royal Commissions, and with the approval of the Metropolitan, their Lordships think this was a "taking other order" within the meaning of the statute. There is no doubt that the Advertisements were carried into effect

legally binding, and were enforced by Royal Commissions. There is no

doubt that they were accepted in some cases by reluctant people, as of legal obligation; and their authority is expressly recognized by the 24th Canon of 1603-4.

In the case of *Macdoughall v. Purrier* (4 Bligh's Reports, 433) the House of Lords presumed the enrolment in Chancery of a Decree of Commissioners appointed by an Act of Henry VIII. for settling the tithes in London, although no such enrolment could be found, on the principle that where instruments have been long acted on and acquiesced in by parties interested in opposing their effect, all formalities shall be presumed to have been observed. No special form of consulting the Metropolitan is prescribed to the Queen.

Their Lordships are now called on to determine the force of the Rubric of 1662, and its effect upon other regulations, such as the Canons of 1603-4. They do not disguise from themselves that the task is difficult.

The learned judge in the Court below has said that "the plain words of the statute, according to the ordinary principles of interpretation, and the construction which they have received in two judgments of the Privy Council, obliged him to presume that the ornaments of the minister, mentioned in the first Prayer Book of Edward VI. are those to which the present Rubric referred" "They are for ministers below the order of bishops, and when officiating at the communion service, cope, vestment or chasuble, surplice, alb, and tunicle; in all other services the surplice only, except that in Cathedral Churches and Colleges, the academical hood may be also worn." He considers that the object of the Advertisements of Elizabeth "was to secure as great an amount of decent Ritual as the circumstances of the time would permit." (Appendix, p. 77.)

"As to the Visitation Articles," from the time of the statute of Charles II., the learned judge observes, "the same principle applies to them as to the Advertisements and Canons, and indeed as to every attempt to procure a decent ritual since Queen Elizabeth's time; namely, that the authorities were content to order the minimum of what was requisite for this purpose." (Appendix, p. 81.) Remarking upon the question whether the consent of the King to the Canons of 1603-4 could be held to be an execution of the powers given to the Queen by the statute of Elizabeth, the learned judge, after some comments which their Lordships do not feel called on to examine, says, "A subsequent statute, which expressly revived a prior statute inconsistent with the Advertisements of Elizabeth, would by necessary implication repeal them." (Appendix, p. 79.)

The Committee is unable to accept this interpretation of the Advertisements and the Visitation Articles as the true one. Their Lordships think that the defacing and destroying, and converting to profane and other uses, of all the vestments now in question, as described in the Lincoln MS., published by Mr. Peacock, show a determination to remove utterly these ornaments, and not to leave them to be used hereafter when higher ritual might become possible. They think that the inquiries of Sandys and Aylmer, already quoted, show that the surplice was not to be the least or lowest, but the only vestment of the parochial clergy. They think that the Articles of Visitation (cited Ritual Commission, Report 2), issued at and after the passing of the Act of Uniformity, which ask after the "fair surplice for the minister to wear at all times of his ministration," without any suggestion of any other vestment, could scarcely have been put forth by bishops desirous

of a more elaborate ritual, and aware that the vestments were now of statutory obligation. They think that in prescribing the surplice only, the Advertisements meant what they said, the surplice only; and that strong steps were taken to insure that only the surplice should be used.

Their Lordships remark further that the doctrine of a minimum of ritual represented by the surplice, with a maximum represented by a return to the mediæval vestments, is inconsistent with the fact that the Rubric is a positive order, under a penal statute, accepted by each clergyman in a remarkably strong expression of "assent and consent," and capable of being enforced with severe penalties. It is not to be assumed without proof that such a statute was framed so as to leave a choice between contrary interpretations, in a question that had ever been regarded as momentous, and had stirred, as the learned judge remarks, some of the strongest passions of man. Historically, all the communications between Archbishop Parker and the Queen and her Government indicate a strong desire for uniformity, and the Articles of Visitation after 1662 were all framed with the like object. If the minister is ordered to wear a surplice at all times of his ministration, he cannot wear an alb and tunicle when assisting at the Holy Communion; if he is to celebrate the Holy Communion in a chasuble, he cannot celebrate in a surplice.

In order to decide the question before the Committee, it seems desirable first to examine the effect of the Church legislation of 1603-4. The 14th Canon orders the use of the Prayer Book without omission or innovation, and the 80th Canon directs that copies of the Prayer Book are to be provided, in its lately revised form, and, by implication, the Ornaments-Rubric is thus made binding on the clergy. Canon 24 directs the use of the cope in cathedral and collegiate churches upon principal feast-days, "according to the Advertisements for this end, anno 7 Elizabeth." Canon 58 says that "every Minister saying the public prayers, or ministering the Sacraments or other rites of the Church, shall wear a decent and comely surplice with sleeves, to be provided at the charge of the parish." There can be no doubt that the intention here was not to set up a contradictory rule, by prescribing vestments in the Prayer Book and a surplice in the Canons which give authority to the Prayer Book. It could not be intended, in recognizing the legal force of the Advertisements, to bring back the things which the Advertisements had taken away, nor could it be expected that either the minister or the people should provide vestments in lieu of those which had been destroyed, and accordingly no direction is given with regard to them. The provisions of the Canons and Prayer Book must be read together, as far as possible, and the Canons upon the vesture of the ministers must be held to be an exposition of and limitation of the Rubric of Ornaments. Such ornaments are to be used as were in use in the second year of Edward VI. limited as to the vestments by the special provisions of the Canons themselves; and the contemporaneous exposition of universal practice shows that this was regarded as the meaning of the Canons. There does not appear to have been any return to the vestments in any quarter whatever.

The Act of 1662 sanctioned a Prayer Book with a different Rubric, but it referred back to the Second of Edward VI., and in some sense or other revived the Rubric of King Edward's First Book; the question is in what sense and in what degree. There seem to be three opinions on this point.

One, that the Act of 1662 repealed all legislation on the subject of the ornaments of the minister; the second, that the Act and the Canons set up two distinct standards of ritual on this subject, and the third, that the Act of 1662 is to be read with the Canons of 1602 still in force, and harmonized with them.

I. The first is that expressed by Dr Lushington in the case of *Westerton v. Liddell*, that in reviving the Rubric of 1549, the Act of 1662 excluded and repealed all provisions whatever of Act of Parliament or Canon which had been made after 1549 and prior to 1662. This view was adopted by Sir John Dodson in the same case when it reached the Arches Court. The consequence of this must be that every celebration of the Holy Communion in a surplice only, from 1662 to the present day, would be a violation of the statute. The Canons of 1603-4 being repealed as to this matter, together with the Advertisements on which the Canons built, there would be no legal warrant for using the surplice and omitting to use the vestments at the Holy Communion. Yet there is no doubt of the practice. For 180 years the vestment was never worn. And thus there would be the unusual occurrence of a statute repealing former legislation and fortified with heavy penalties, which was systematically broken, not only by one and all of those who had declared their unfeigned assent and consent to all in the Book of Common Prayer, but by the framers of the Rubric themselves immediately after the confirmation of it by Act of Parliament. Nor is there during that time one single instance of calling to account or censuring any one for his particular share in a universal violation of the law. It appears plain to their Lordships from these facts that the idea of the repealing power of this Rubric is a modern one.

But the 24th clause of the Act of Uniformity shows that it was not the intention of the passers of the Act to repeal past laws. It provides that "the several good laws and statutes of this realm which are now in force, for the uniformity of prayer and the administration of the Sacraments . . . shall stand in full force and strength, to all intents and purposes whatever, for the establishing and confirming the said Book." The laws were to remain; but they were to bear on the new Book of Common Prayer, and not upon any former one. Now the Prayer Book up to that time in use—the Book which was the subject of the Hampton Court Conference—rested upon the Canons of 1603-4; and it is hard to suppose that the most obvious "laws" of all those in force up to that moment were excluded from the saving power of this 24th clause. Their Lordships think that the Canons relating to the vestments of the ministers were not repealed by the Act of Uniformity, and that the Canons had the same force after the passing of that Act which they had before. The contemporary exposition on this point is very strong. Bishop Henchman, of Salisbury, in 1662, in inquiring whether his churches are provided with the Prayer Book "newly established," inquires for the "comely large, and fine surplice," and for no other vestment. The same inquiry for the "comely large surplice, for the minister to wear at all times of his ministration," is found in a number of visitation articles, republished by the Ritual Commission (Report 2, Appendix, p. 606, 614 and following), extending from 1662 to the end of the century. Bishop Fuller, of Lincoln, A.D. 1671, Bishop Gunning, of Ely, A.D. 1679, and Bishop Trimmell, of Norwich, A.D. 1716, refer to the 58th Canon as unrepealed, in the margin of their visitation articles upon the surplice. Their Lordships are of opinion

that the Canon was not repealed, and that the ecclesiastical authorities had no suspicion that it had been.

II. The next opinion is that the Canons and the Act of Uniformity, being irreconcilable, set up distinct standards of ritual, the one of a more elaborate and the other of a severer type; the one a maximum and the other a minimum; the one represented by the Rubric and the other by the 58th Canon. To this view the learned judge in the court below appears to incline. Their Lordships, notwithstanding this authority, are obliged to come to the conclusion that this view is at variance with all the facts of the case. They have already observed that the chasuble, alb, and tunicle were swept away with severe exactness in the time of Queen Elizabeth, and that there was no trace of any attempt to revive them. The Act of Uniformity reflects, by the strictness of its provisions, the temper of the framers. The fate of a "proviso as to the dispensation with deprivation, for not using the cross and surplice," which was sent down from the House of Lords to the House of Commons, illustrates this. The Commons rejected the proviso (Commons' Journals, vol. viii p. 413), and in the subsequent conference between the two Houses, the Manager, Serjeant Charlton, gave amongst other reasons for rejecting the proviso, "that it would unavoidably establish schism . . . that he thought it better to impose no ceremonies than to dispense with any; and he thought it very incongruous at the same time when you are settling uniformity to establish schism" (Lords' Journals, vol. xi. p. 449 a). And the House of Lords agreed that this proviso should be struck out (Lords' Journals, vol. xi. pp. 450 a, 450 b). It cannot be supposed that an Act which applied the principle of uniformity so strictly in one direction was intended on the other to open the door to a return to practices that were suspected as Romish, and this without serious remonstrance in either House from the minority. The purpose of the Act is clear. It was to establish a uniformity upon all parties alike. That is its language, and that is the interpretation it bore with those in authority who had to expound it in visitation articles and the like.

III. The third opinion remains, that the provisions of the Rubric of Edward the Sixth are continued, so far as they are not contrariant to other provisions still in force. And here it is to be observed again that the Rubric was altered, after refusal to listen to the Puritan objections, to a form different from that of any former Rubric, by introducing the word "retained." Both in the statute of Elizabeth and in the Rubric in question the word "retain" seems to mean that things should remain as they were at the time of the enactment. Chasuble, alb, and tunicle had disappeared for more than sixty years; and it has been argued fairly that this word would not have force to bring back any thing that had disappeared more than a generation ago. To retain means, in common parlance, to continue something now in existence. It is reasonable to presume that the alteration was not made without some purpose; and it appears to their Lordships that the words of the Rubric, strictly construed, would not suffice to revive ornaments which had been lawfully set aside, although they were in use in the second year of Edward VI. But whether this be so or not, their Lordships are of opinion that as the Canons of 1603-4, which in one part seemed to revive the vestments, and in another to order the surplice for all ministrations, ought to be construed together so that the Act of Uniformity is to be construed with the two Canons

on this subject which it did not repeal, and that the result is that the cope is to be worn in ministering the Holy Communion on high feast days in cathedrals and collegiate churches, and the surplice in all other ministrations. Their Lordships attach great weight to the abundant evidence which now exists that from the days of Elizabeth to about 1840 the practice is uniformly in accordance with this view, and is irreconcilable with either of the other views. Through the researches that have been referred to in these remarks a clear and abundant *expositio contemporanea* had been supplied which compensates for the scantiness of other materials for a judgment.

It is quite true that neither contrary practice nor disuse can repeal the positive enactment of a statute, but contemporaneous and continuous usage is of the greatest efficacy in law for determining the true construction of obscurely framed documents. In the case of the Bristol Charities (2 Jac. and Walker, 321) Lord Eldon observes, "Length of time (though it must be admitted that the charity is not barred by it) is a very material consideration when the question is, what is the effect and true construction of the instrument? Is it according to the practice and enjoyment which has obtained for more than two centuries? or has that practice and enjoyment been a breach of trust?" We may ask in like manner what is the true construction of the Act of 1662 and of the Rubric which it sanctioned? Is it according to the practice of two centuries, or was the practice a continual breach of the law, commanded and enforced by the Bishops, including the very Bishops who aided in framing the Act?

The learned judge relies on two former judgments of this Committee, as having almost determined the question of vestments; one of them in the case of *Liddell v. Westerton*, and the other in the case of *Martin v. Mackonochie*.

In *Liddell v. Westerton*, the question which their Lordships had to decide was whether the Rubric which excluded all use of crosses in the service affected crosses not used in the service but employed for decoration of the building only, and they determined that these were unaffected by the Rubric.

They decided that the Rubric in question referred to the Act passed in 2 and 3 Edward VI., adopting the first Prayer Book, and not to any canons or injunctions having the authority of Parliament, but adopted at an earlier period. Their Lordships feel quite free to adopt both the positive and the negative conclusions thus arrived at. In construing the expressions made use of in that judgment, it should be borne in mind that this question of the vestments was not before the Court.

In *Martin v. Mackonochie* the Committee stated anew the substance of the Judgment in *Liddell v. Westerton* upon this point, but did not propose to take up any new ground.

Their Lordships will advise her Majesty that the defendant Mr. Purchas has offended against the laws ecclesiastical in wearing the chasuble, alb, and tunicle; and that a monition shall issue against the defendant accordingly.

With respect to the cap called a biretta, which the defendant is said to have carried in his hand, but not to have worn in church, their Lordships would not be justified, upon the evidence before them, in pronouncing that the defendant did an unlawful act.

As to the holy or consecrated water in the church, the evidence does not

go the full extent of the charge. There is no proof whatever that the water placed in the church was consecrated at all, nor that it was put there by the defendant with the purpose of its being used as the congregation seem to have used it. This is a penal proceeding, and each charge must be strictly proved as alleged. Upon this point, too, the appeal must be disallowed.

Their Lordships now proceed to the 16th article, which charges that, on a certain day, the defendant "administered wine mixed with water instead of wine to the communicants at the Lord's Supper." The learned judge in the Court below has decided that it is illegal to mix water with the wine at the time of the service of Holy Communion; but he decides that water may be mixed with the wine "provided that the mingling be not made at the time of the celebration." For this view the learned judge quotes, amongst other authorities, Bishop Andrewes, but it has escaped him that the practice of Bishop Andrewes was that which he condemns; in his Consecration Service, the Bishop directs as follows—*Episcopus de novo in calicem ex poculo quod in sacrâ mensâ stabat, effundit, admistâque aquâ, recitat clare verba illa consecratoria.* (Sparrow's Articles, &c.) The learned judge considers that the act of mixing has some symbolical meaning, but he holds that it was "wholly unconnected with any Papal superstition, or any doctrine which the Church of England has rejected." (Appendix, p. 88.) Nor does it appear that the controversy between the Romish and Reformed Churches turned so much upon the symbolism of the mixed cup as upon the necessity of its use.

Their Lordships find here two questions for their consideration. Since it has been decided by this Committee that additional ceremonies or innovations are excluded by implication by the service for Holy Communion; or, in other words, that the service for Holy Communion is not only a guide, but a sufficient guide in its celebration, and since the learned judge has decided that the act of mingling wine with water in the service, with a view to its administration, is one of the additional ceremonies so excluded, the first question is whether the doing the act before the service, and in the vestry or elsewhere, could so alter the symbolical character of the act that the cup might be brought in and consecrated and administered to the people, without constituting an innovation or additional ceremonial act, beyond what is ordered in the service.

If this question be decided in the affirmative, the second question would be whether, upon a fair construction of the directions of the Rubrics, this previous mingling could take place without violation of the Rubrics?

The first question is, whether this is an additional ceremony, not provided in the Rubric? the second question is, whether it is contrary to the express directions of the Rubric?

On the former question their Lordships observe that, whether the water mingled with the wine be used because Christ Himself is believed to have used it, or in order to symbolize the water from the rock given to the thirsty Israelites, or the blood and water from the side of the Lord, or the union of Christ with His people (the water being a type of the people), or the union of two natures in one Lord, it can scarcely be said that the reception of the mingled chalice had no share in this symbolism, but only the act of mingling. Their Lordships are unable to arrive at the conclusion that, if the mingling and administering in the service water and wine is an additional ceremony, and so

unlawful, it becomes lawful by removing from the service the act of mingling but keeping the mingled cup itself and administering it. But neither Eastern nor Western Church, so far as the Committee is aware, has any custom of mixing the water with wine apart from and before the service.

As to the second question, the addition of water is prescribed in the Prayer Book of 1549; it has disappeared from all the later books, and this omission must have been designed. The Rubric of 1662, following that of 1604, says, "The bread and wine for the Communion shall be provided by the curate and churchwardens at the charges of the parish." So far wine not mixed with water must be intended. The priest is directed in the Rubric before the Prayer for the Church Militant to place on the table "so much bread and wine as he shall think sufficient." Of so much of this wine as may remain unconsecrated, it is said that "the curate shall have it to his own use." These directions make it appear that the wine has not been mingled with water, but remains the same throughout. If the wine had been mingled with water before being placed on the table, then the portion of it that might revert to the curate would undergo this symbolical mixing, which cannot surely have been intended.

Their Lordships gladly leave these niceties of examination, to observe that they doubt whether this part of the article is of much importance. As the learned judge has decided that the act of mingling the water with the wine in the service is illegal, the private mingling of the wine is not likely to find favour with any. Whilst the former practice has prevailed both in the East and the West, and is of great antiquity, the latter practice has not prevailed at all; and it would be a manifest deviation from the Rubric of the Prayer Book of Edward VI. as well as from the exceptional practice and directions of Bishop Andrewes. Upon this 16th article, however, whether it be more or less important, their Lordships allow the appeal, and will advise that a monition should issue against the defendant.

The 20th article charges the defendant with using on divers occasions "wafer bread, being bread made in the special shape and fashion of circular wafers, instead of bread such as is usual to be eaten," and administering the same to the communicants. The Rubric of the Prayer Book now in force runs thus.—"And to take away all occasion of dissension and superstition which any person hath or might have concerning the bread and wine, it shall suffice that the bread be such as is usual to be eaten, but the best and purest wheat bread that conveniently may be gotten." This is the same with the Rubric of 1552, 1559, and 1604, with two exceptions. The present Rubric omits after "eaten" the words "at the table with other meats," and it introduces words which have been prominent in the argument in this case; instead of "to take away the superstition," it reads "to take away all occasion of dissension and superstition." In the first Book of Edward VI. the direction is different: "For avoiding all matter and occasion of dissension, it is meet that the bread prepared for the Communion be made, through all this realm, after one sort or fashion, that is to say, unleavened and round, as it was afore, but without all manner of print, and something more larger and thicker than it was, so that it may be aptly divided into divers pieces, and every one shall be divided in two pieces at the least, or more by the discretion of the minister, and distributed." One of the Elizabethan injunctions is at variance with the Elizabethan Rubric, continued from the second Book of King Edward, and pro-

vides as follows :—"Where also it was in the time of King Edward VI. used to have the sacramental bread of common fine bread, it is ordered for the more reverence to be given to the holy mysteries, being the Sacraments of the body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ, that this same sacramental bread be made and formed plain, without any figure thereupon, of the same fineness and fashion, round though somewhat bigger in compass and thickness, as the usual bread and wafer heretofore named singing-cakes, which served for the use of the private masses." (Cardwell.) The learned judge calls this injunction a *contemporanea expositio* of the Rubric, but it is in fact a superseding of the Rubric, nor can it be regarded as at all reconcilable with it. Upon these facts the learned judge decides as follows.—"It appears, therefore, that while the first Rubric prescribed a uniformity of size and material, the later and the present Rubric are contented with the order that the purest wheaten flour shall suffice, and the bread may be leavened according to the use of the Eastern, or unleavened according to the use of the Western Church."

Their Lordships do not find any mention of flour, and apart from this slight inadvertence, their Lordships are unable to accept this view of the passages that have been quoted. The first Book of Edward has in view uniformity of practice, and not the choice of two practices; the bread is to be made "through all this realm after the same sort and fashion." The second Book of Edward VI. is not so positive in form, for the words "it shall suffice" are used; but it produced uniformity and not diversity, for the injunction of 1559 says, "It was in the time of King Edward VI., used to have the sacramental bread of common fine bread." This general use the injunction proposes to change; but again the order is universal, and binds the very minutest details; the bread is to be plain without any figure, fashioned round but somewhat bigger in compass and thicker than the cakes used in private masses: there is no trace of an intention to leave men free to follow the fashion of the Eastern or of the Western Church. So there are three distinct orders, first, for wafer bread, unleavened as before, but larger and without print; then for common bread usual at the table; then for a new kind of bread thicker than the wafer and without symbolical figures; and the first and last are in their form universal and absolute, and the second also had brought about a general usage and not a diversity. There was, no doubt, a great division of opinion upon this question; and this makes it all the more remarkable that none of the three orders takes the natural course of leaving the matter free. Each seems to have aimed at uniformity, but each in a different practice.

But it has been argued by some that the phrase "it shall suffice" implies a permission; that the words may mean, "it shall be sufficient, but another usage is allowed and might even be better." On the other hand, it has been argued, that in other places in the Liturgy "it shall suffice" must be construed into a positive direction; that if "it shall suffice" to pour water on a sickly child, this ought to restrain the clergyman from immersing a child known to be sickly; that even the weaker form "it may suffice" in the Rubric as to children and infants brought to be baptized, conveys to the minister a distinct direction as to what he is to do, and leaves no alternative course apparent; that "it shall suffice that the Litany be once read" for both deacons and priests is meant to be, and is received as a positive order; and that in such cases "it shall suffice" means "it shall be sufficient for the completeness

of a sacrament or for the observance by the minister of the Rubric." Their Lordships are disposed to construe this phrase in each case according to the context. Here the expression is "to do away all occasion of dissension and superstition . . . it shall suffice." If these words left the whole matter open, and only provided that the usual bread shall be sufficient where it happened to be used, it is difficult to see how either dissension or superstition would be taken away; not dissension, for there would be a licence that had not existed since the Reformation; not superstition, for the old wafer with its "print," its "figures," which the first Book of Edward and the injunctions desired might be excluded, might now be used if this Rubric were the only restraint. Their Lordships are therefore inclined to think on this ground alone that the Rubric contains a positive direction to employ at the Holy Communion the usual bread. It is at least worthy of notice that when Cosin and others at the last revision desired to insert the words making the wafer also lawful, these words were rejected.

But their Lordships attach greater weight to the exposition of this Rubric furnished by the history of the question. From a large collection of Visitation Articles, from the time of Charles II, it is clear that the best and purest wheat bread was to be provided for the Holy Communion, and no other kind of bread. They believe that from that time till about 1840 the practice of using the usual wheat bread was universal.

The words of the 20th Canon, to which the Visitation Articles refer, point the same way. The churchwardens are bound to supply "wheaten bread," and this alone is mentioned. If wafer bread is equally permitted, or the special cakes of Edward VI.'s first Book and of the injunctions, it is hard to see why the parish is to supply wheaten bread, in cases where wafers are to be supplied by the minister or from some other source. And if wafers were to be in use, a general injunction to all churchwardens to supply wheaten bread would be quite inapplicable to all churches where there should be another usage.

Upon the whole, their Lordships think that the law of the Church has directed the use of pure wheat bread, and they must so advise her Majesty.

It remains to consider part of the 17th article of charge, which sets out that the respondent, during the whole of the Prayer of Consecration at the Holy Communion, "stood at the middle of that side of the holy table which, if the said holy table stood at the east end of the said church or chapel (the said table in St. James's Chapel, in fact, standing at the west end thereof), would be the west side of such table, in such wise that you then stood between the people and the said holy table, with your back to the people, so that the people could not see you break the bread or take the cup into your hand." The learned judge deals with this charge very briefly, believing it to have been settled by this Committee in the judgment in *Martin v. Mackonochie*. He says, "I must observe that the Rubric does not require the people should see the breaking of the bread, or the taking of the cup into the priest's hands; and if it did so prescribe, the evidence in this case would establish that all the congregation could see him take the cup into his hand, and some of them at least could see him break the bread." The Rubric on this point is this: "When the priest, standing before the table, hath so ordered the bread and wine, that he may with the more readiness and decency break the bread before the people, and take the cup into his hands, he shall say the Prayer of Consecration as followeth." Their Lordships are of opinion that these words

mean that the priest is so to stand that the people present may see him break the bread and take the cup into his hands; although the learned judge is right if he means to say that the mere words do not speak of seeing.

Their Lordships think that the evidence of the witness Verrall, which there is no reason to doubt, proves that "generally the congregation could not see" the breaking of the bread, because the respondent had his back turned to them. As regards the cup, the witness said that they could see him take the cup into his hand, but being asked further, he says, "I could tell he was taking the cup into his hand." This is consistently explained by supposing that the witness and others could see a certain motion of the Respondent which from their knowledge of the service and from the subsequent elevation they were sure was the taking of the cup into his hands. It would probably be impossible in any position so to act that all the congregation could see or that all should be unable to see; but we take it as proved that the greater part of the congregation could not see the breaking of the bread or the act of taking the cup into the hands.

The facts being established, their Lordships proceed to consider the question itself. In default of argument on the respondent's side, they have been somewhat aided by a large mass of controversial literature, which shows how much interest this question excites, and which has probably left few of the facts unnoticed.

The Rubric upon the position of the table directs that it shall "stand in the body of the church or in the chancel, where morning and evening prayer are appointed to be said." This is the same as the Rubric of 1552, 1559, and 1604, excepting the verbal alteration of *are* for *be*. It goes on, "And the priest standing at the north end of the table, shall say the Lord's Prayer with the Collect following" The table is a movable table. By the injunctions of Queen Elizabeth (Cardwell, *Doc Annals*, I, p 210) it is ordered "that the holy table in every church be decently made and set in the place where the altar stood, and there commonly covered as thereto belongeth, and as shall be appointed by the visitors, and so to stand, saving when the Communion of the Sacrament is to be distributed, at which time the same shall be so placed in good sort within the chancel, as whereby the minister may be more conveniently heard of the communicants in his prayer and ministrations, and the communicants also more conveniently and in more number communicate with the said minister. And after the Communion is done, from time to time, the same holy table to be placed where it stood before." If this custom still prevailed of bringing the table from the east and placing it in the chancel, the two Rubrics would present no difficulty. The priest standing on the north side as directed by the one, would also be standing before the table so as to break the bread before the people, and take the cup into his hand as required by the other. No direction was given for a change of position in the Prayer of Consecration in the second Book of King Edward VI, but only a change of posture in the words "standing up." But before the time of the Revision of 1662 the custom of placing the table along the east wall was becoming general, and it may fairly be said that the revisers must have had this in view. The following questions appear to require an answer, in order to dispose of this part of the case; what is meant by the "north side of the table?" What change, if any, is ordered by the Rubric before the Prayer of Consecration? And what is the meaning of "before the people" in that Rubric?

As to the first question, their Lordships are of opinion that "north side of the table" means that side which looks towards the north.

They have considered some ingenious arguments intended to prove that "north side" means that part of the west side that is nearest to the north. One of these is that the middle of the altar before the Reformation was occupied by a stone or slab called *mensa consecratoria* and *sigillum altaris*; that the part of the altar north of this was called north side, and that to the south of it was called the south side. Without inquiring whether English altars were generally so constructed, which is to say the least doubtful, their Lordships observe that in the directions for the substitution of a movable table for the altar and for its decent covering, and its position at various times, there is no hint that this is to revive this peculiarity of the altar which it replaced; and they do not believe that the table was so arranged or divided.

Another argument is drawn from the Jewish Ritual. On offering sacrifices before the Lord, the altar was to be sprinkled with the blood, and a red line was drawn across the altar to mark the height at which it should be sprinkled, and it is argued that the line being only in front, the priest must have stood in front in order to see it and be guided by it. But on the other hand the line probably went all round the altar, and the sprinkling was applied to all the sides. And even if the fact was rightly stated, it would be impossible to allow an argument so remote and shadowy to supersede the plain sense of a direction so clear in itself. When the table was placed in the body of the church or chancel, the priest or minister was to stand on the north side of it, looking south.

When it became the custom to place the table altarwise against the east wall, the Rubric remained the same. And there are many authorities to show that the position of the Minister was still upon the north side or end facing south. It is only necessary to cite a few. Archdeacon Pory (1662), in his Visitation Articles, says, "The minister standing, as he is appointed, at the north side or end of the table when he celebrates the Holy Communion." In the dispute between the Vicar of Grantham and his parishioners (1627), Bishop Williams plainly shows that whichever way the table was to stand, which was the matter in dispute, the position of the minister was on the north. "If you mean by altarwise that the table shall stand along close by the wall, so that you be forced to officiate at one end thereof (as you may have observed in great men's chapels), I do not believe that ever the Communion tables were otherwise than by casualty so placed in country churches." He also says, "I conceive the alteration was made in the Rubric to show which way the celebrant was to face" (Heylin, "Coale from the Altar," and Williams, "Holy Table.") Heylin says, quoting the Latin Prayer Book of 1560, "I presume that no man of reason can deny but that the northern end or side, call it which you will, is *pars septentrionalis*, the northern part." ("Coale from the Altar.") When Bishop Wren was impeached in the House of Lords, A.D. 1636, for consecrating the elements on the west side of the table, he answered that he stood on the north side at all the rest of the service except at the Prayer of Consecration. "He humbly conceiveth it is a plain demonstration that he came to the west side only for the convenience of executing his office, and no way at all in any superstition, much less in any imitation of the Romish priests, for they place themselves there at all the

service before and at all after, with no less strictness than at the time of consecrating the bread and wine" Nicholls (*Commentary on Common Prayer*, published 1710), Bennett (*Annotations on Book of Common Prayer*, 1708), Wheatley (*Rational Illustrations of Common Prayer*, 1710), confirm the view that when the table was placed east and west the minister's position was still on the north

Their Lordships entertain no doubt whatever that when the table was set at the east end the direction to stand at the north side was understood to apply to the north end, and that this was the practice of the Church

It will be convenient to consider next what is the meaning of the words "before the people," in the Rubric before the Consecration Prayer. Nicholls (*Op. cit.*) observes, "To say the Consecration Prayer (in the recital of which the bread is broken) standing before the table, is not to break the bread before the people; for then the people cannot have a view thereof, which our wise reformers, upon very good reasoning, ordered that they should." That stress was laid on this witness of the people of the act of breaking, appears by other passages; for example, Udall says, "We press the action of breaking the bread against the papist. To what end, if not that the beholders might thereby be led unto the breaking of the body of Christ?" (*Communion Comeliness*, 1641.) Wheatley (*Op. cit.*) says, "Whilst the priest is ordering the bread and wine he is to stand before the table; but when he says the prayer he is to stand so that he may with more readiness and decency break the bread before the people, which must be on the north side. For if he stood before the table, his body would hinder the people from seeing, so that he must not stand there, and, consequently, he must stand on the north side, there being, in our present Rubric, no other place for the performance of any part of this office."

Their Lordships consider that the defendant, in standing with his back to the people, disobeyed the Rubric in preventing the people from seeing the breaking of the bread.

The north side being the proper place for the minister throughout the Communion office, and also whilst he is saying the Prayer of Consecration, the question remains, whether the words "standing before the table" direct any temporary change of position in the minister before saying the Prayer of Consecration? This is not the most important, but it is the most difficult question. One opinion is that of Wheatley, quoted above, that the Rubric sends the priest to the west side of the table to order the elements, and recalls him for the prayer itself. This, however, would be needless if the elements were so placed on the table as that the priest could, "with readiness and decency," order them from the north side, as is often done

It would also be needless in any case where the Communion table was placed in the body of the church, or in the chancel with its ends east and west. And though this position is not likely now to be adopted, the question is whether that was the law at the time this Rubric was drawn. Now the Rubric prescribes that the table shall stand "in the body of the church, or in the chancel where morning and evening prayers are appointed to be said;" and there are two cases, which occurred in 1633, those of Crayford (*Cardwell, Doc. Annals*, II. 226) and St. Gregory's London (*Ibid.* II. 237), which show that the table, though placed at the east end, might be moved for convenience' sake and under competent authority. This, too, is the view of Bishop Wren in 1636 (*Ibid.* II. 252), "That the Communion table in every

church do always stand close under the east wall of the chancel, the ends thereof north and south, unless the ordinary give particular directions otherwise." Should the table be placed with its ends east and west, it would be absurd to enforce a rule that the priest should go to the west end to order the elements, seeing the north side would be in every way more convenient.

Upon these facts their Lordships incline to think that the Rubric was purposely framed so as not to direct or insist on a change of position in the minister, which might be needless; though it does direct a change of posture from kneeling to standing. The words are intended to set the minister free for the moment from the general direction to stand at the north side, for the special purpose of ordering the elements; but whether for this purpose he would have to change the side or not is not determined, as it would depend upon the position of the table in the church or chancel, and on the position in which the elements were placed on the table at first. They think that the main object of this part of the Rubric is the ordering of the elements, and that the words "before the table" do not necessarily mean "between the table and the people," and are not intended to limit to any side.

The learned Judge in the Court below, in considering the charge against the defendant that he stood with his back to the people during the Prayer of Consecration, briefly observes, "the question appears to me to have been settled by the Privy Council in the case of *Martin v. Mackonochie*." The question before their Lordships in that case was as to the posture, and not as to the position, of the minister. The words of the judgment are — "Their Lordships entertain no doubt on the construction of this Rubric" [before the Prayer of Consecration] "that the priest is intended to continue in one posture during the prayer, and not to change from standing to kneeling, or *vice versa*; and it appears to them equally certain that the priest is intended to stand and not to kneel. They think that the words 'standing before the table' apply to the whole sentence; and they think this is made more apparent by the consideration that acts are to be done by the priest before the people as the prayer proceeds (such as taking the paten and chalice into his hands, breaking the bread, and laying his hand on the various vessels), which could only be done in the attitude of standing."

This passage refers to posture or attitude from beginning to end, and not to position with reference to the sides of the table. And it could not be construed to justify Mr. Purchas in standing with his back to the people, unless a material addition were made to it. The learned Judge reads it as if it ran, "They think that the words 'standing before the table' apply to the whole sentence, and that before the table means between the table and the people on the west side." But these last words are mere assumption. The question of position was not before their Lordships, if it had been, no doubt the passage would have been conceived differently, and the question of position expressly settled.

Upon the whole, then, their Lordships think that the words of Archdeacon, afterwards Bishop, Cosin in A.D. 1687 express the state of the law, "Doth he [the minister] stand at the north side of the table, and perform all things there, but when he hath special cause to remove from it, as in reading or preaching upon the Gospel, or in delivering the Sacrament to the communicants, or other occasions of the like nature." (Bishop Cosin's Correspondence. Part I., p 106. Surtees Society.) They think that the Prayer of

Consecration is to be used at the north side of the table, so that the minister looks south, whether a broader or a narrower side of the table be towards the north.

It is mentioned that Mr Purchas' chapel does not stand in the usual position, and that, in fact, he occupied the east side when he stood with his back towards the people. If it had happened, as it does in one of the Chapels Royal, that the north side had been where the west side usually is, a question between the letter and spirit of the Rubrics would have arisen. But the defendant seems to us to have departed both from the letter and the spirit of the Rubrics, and our advice to her Majesty will be that a monition should issue to him as to this charge also.

As all the charges have been proved against the defendant, except as to two less important particulars, we direct that he shall pay the costs in this Court and in the Court below.

III.

THE TICHBORNE CASE.

We do not propose this year to set before our readers a full and detailed report of the proceedings in this celebrated trial, which, when the year closed, had lasted seventy days, and had comprised the "Plaintiff's Case" only. It will on all accounts be more convenient to wait until the whole case has closed before attempting to report it in our ordinary form; and we shall content ourselves for the present with a brief summary of the results of the inquiry, so far as it this year proceeded.

The trial commenced in June, under the name of "*Tichborne v Lushington*," in the Court of Common Pleas, before Lord Chief-Justice Bovill and a special Jury. Mr. Sergeant Ballantine, Mr. Giffard, Q.C., Mr. Pollard, Mr. Jenne, and Mr. W. B. Rose, appeared for the Plaintiff; Sir John Coleridge (Solicitor and afterwards Attorney-General), Mr. Hawkins, Q.C., Sir G. Honeyman, Q.C., Mr. Chapman Barber, and Mr. Bowen, were counsel for the defence; Mr. Henry Matthews, Q.C., was for the Trustees of the Doughty Estate.

The action was in the form of an ejectment; and the issue to be determined, as defined by the Court of Chancery (whence the case came), was, whether the claimant was or was not the heir of Sir James Tichborne, who died in the year 1862, or, to use the language of Sergeant Ballantine, "whether a person who now claims to be entitled to an ancient baronetcy and extensive estates, is really the true heir, or is, in truth, an outrageous impostor." Upon that issue the claimant having to make out that he was the heir, he, of course, began, and it is only from his evidence the present account is collected.

The heir of Sir James Tichborne was his son Roger, who was born in 1829. His parents—his mother being a Frenchwoman—resided in France, and there he was born and brought up, until he was 14 or 15 years of age. Consequently he spoke French with facility; and it appears that he even spoke English with a French accent. His parents being Roman Catholics, he was sent to Stonyhurst College for education, and was there three or four

years. In October, 1849, he entered the army, and obtained a commission in a cavalry regiment (the Carabineers), stationed first at Canterbury, and afterwards in Dublin and other parts of Ireland. His parents continued to reside in Paris, and he corresponded with them in terms of affection. Many of his letters were produced and printed, and it is enough to say of them that they are written with propriety as to ideas, and feelings, and expression, and that, though they contained some minor misspellings and some Gallicism, they have no vulgarities. Witnesses stated that at this time Roger Tichborne was pale and thin, and that he had good manners. He, of course, moved in good society; one of his intimate friends was Sir Clifford Constable, whom he visited at Burton. He was connected on his mother's side with the family of the Seymours, and on his father's side with the best Roman Catholic families, including the Townleys and the Radcliffes, and among others he knew was Mr. Radcliffe, who afterwards married Miss Doughty. When he attained the age of 21, which was on the 5th of January, 1852, he joined in disentailing the estates, on which occasion a Mr Hopkins acted as his attorney. It should be stated here that the family attorney was a gentleman named Gosford, in whom Roger Tichborne had great confidence, and with whom he was always on terms of personal intimacy. Roger was on duty with his regiment in Ireland until January, 1853, except during temporary leave of absence. When he had leave of absence he used to stay with his uncle, Sir Edward Doughty, who then held the baronetcy and estates at Tichborne-park, and there he fell in love with his cousin, Kate Doughty, then a girl of 17. The Christmas of 1851 was spent by Roger Tichborne at his uncle's, and there he appears to have proposed to his cousin, and to have been rejected. This appears from his letters to have occurred in January, 1852, and the date proved important. The event appears to have greatly affected him, for on the 5th of January he wrote that he intended going abroad, and desired to make certain arrangements as to his estate, and that he had confided his private wishes and intentions to Mr. Gosford. There is no doubt that he deposited with Mr. Gosford a sealed packet containing his last wishes and intentions, and the claimant, in his evidence, stated that there were no other private wishes and intentions than those contained in the packet. This, it will be observed, was on the 7th of January, 1852. Ten days later he was in Paris, where he arrived on the 16th, and next day wrote to Mr. Gosford, alluding in terms of bitter disappointment to the sudden termination of his visit to Tichborne. Early in February he wrote to his cousin in terms of affection, referring sorrowfully to the breaking-off of their engagement, and alluding to an angry interview with his uncle, which had led to his sudden departure. Again, next day, he wrote to her in terms which indicated that he had been rejected on account of some fault in his character; and he declared that he should occupy three years in trying to reform and in becoming all she wished. It appears that he still entertained a hope at some future time of marrying her, and on the 22nd of June, 1852, he signed a paper, in which he solemnly vowed to build a church if his hopes should be realized. While in this state of mind he threw up his commission and made arrangements for going abroad for a year or so. Some of the last letters of Roger Tichborne while in England were to Miss Doughty. Thus on the 6th of December, 1852, he wrote to her in affectionate terms that he was unable to come down and see her, as he had to go to Paris to see his

parents, and that he should probably remain there until a week or ten days before he embarked for South America. He told her that he should be glad to hear from her, and would certainly answer her letters, and give her an account of his wanderings. He went to Paris accordingly to see his parents, and promised them to return immediately in the event of his father's death. His mother said —

“When Roger quitted Paris, just before his departure, his father, after having vainly tried to make him give up the idea of going away, at last told him that, at least if God was to take him, he hoped he would come back immediately to be his mother's protector. To that he readily consented, and said that in that melancholy case he would return to his mother.”—(Letter, Oct. 17, 1865.)

Early in 1853 Roger went to London to make final arrangements for his voyage. From London he wrote to his parents in affectionate terms. In this letter he stated that his intention was to go to South America, and to be abroad “a year or eighteen months.” He sailed from Havre on the 1st of March, 1853, for Valparaiso, with one Moore as his servant, and from the time of his arrival in South America he continued to write to his mother, or his aunt, Lady Doughty, or Mrs. Seymour. He arrived at Valparaiso on the 19th of June, 1853. He stayed there only a few days, and went to Callao, and thence to Lima. Thence he went a fortnight's excursion to Guayaquil, and then, on the 12th of December, back to Valparaiso, and thence to Santiago. This was on the 11th of January, 1854, and from Santiago he went across the Cordilleras, to Mendoza, and thence, on the 13th of February, to Buenos Ayres. He then wrote that he should go to Montevideo on his way to Brazil, and that he should go thence to Kingston, Jamaica, on his way to Mexico. On the 29th of June, 1853, Roger wrote from Valparaiso to Mr. Gosford, mentioning that he had heard of the death of his uncle, by which his father had succeeded to the baronetcy, and that he presumed his parents were settled at Tichborne. He had arrived, he said, at Valparaiso on the 19th of June, and he intended to go to Lima, and then to Chili and Peru, and so to work his way to the south in the spring, so as to be at Buenos Ayres or Montevideo. The letters of Roger Tichborne did not, so far as had appeared, mention any stay at Mellapilla, and his journal had not yet been put in. The claimant stated that he was there for some weeks, and that he there made the acquaintance of a family named De Castro, whose name he afterwards assumed. It appeared in evidence that Orton also was at Mellapilla (though at what precise time was uncertain), for De Castro, in writing to the claimant, stated that the person whom he described as “Sir Roger,” bore the name of Arthur Orton, and sent home a lock of hair which at first the claimant declared to be his own, but which afterwards he said had been cut from the head of Orton. In December, 1853, Roger wrote to his mother, giving an account of his journey to Lima. From Lima, he said, he went back to Valparaiso, on his way to Santiago; from which place he said he meant to go to Buenos Ayres and Montevideo, and cross the Cordilleras and the Pampas. He hoped, he said, to find letters at Buenos Ayres or Montevideo, and he very carefully gave an address at Bahia for the purpose of correspondence. On the 24th of February, 1854, Roger wrote from Buenos Ayres an affectionate letter to his aunt, Lady Doughty (the mother of the cousin to whom he had been attached)—a most affectionate letter—sending her some

presents, begging her to write, giving his address at Kingston, Jamaica, and sending his love to his cousin Kate. The terms of this letter indicate that he had already corresponded with them, and it will have been seen that he had promised to do so. On the 1st of March, 1854, Roger wrote to his mother from Buenos Ayres the last letter prior to his departure. In this he stated that he should in a few days leave for Montevideo, where he should remain for a few days before he went to Brazil. "When you answer this letter," he wrote, "direct yours to Post-office, Kingston, Jamaica, where I shall call to get my letters on my way to Mexico, where I expect to be about three months and a half." In this letter he alludes to a journal he kept, and which he said he should copy out when he had time. On the 20th of April, 1854, he sailed from Rio in a ship called the "*Bella*," which foundered at sea, and was treated by the owners and underwriters as lost; and from that time until the claimant appeared nothing more was heard of Roger Tichborne. A Chancery suit was instituted, in which his death was legally proved. Year after year rolled by, his cousin Kate married Mr. Radcliffe, his father died, and his death was widely published, but nothing was heard of him until the plaintiff set up his claim. The claimant certainly was in Australia subsequently to the loss of the "*Bella*," but at what period he arrived there is of course in dispute. His case is that he is Roger Tichborne, that he was picked up at sea with several other of the seamen, and carried to Melbourne; but of this, as yet, there has been no other evidence than his own statement, which, of course, is disputed. As already mentioned, Roger, before he embarked, had heard of the death of his uncle, Sir Edward, of his father's succession to the title and estates, and he had a considerable sum at his banker's. The claimant stated that from 1854 to 1865 he passed under the name of De Castro, and that he was occupied with horses, slaughtering, &c. In 1862 he was at Wagga-Wagga looking after horses, slaughtering, &c. While there he was in difficulties, and he made the acquaintance of an attorney named Gibbes, whom he described as his "best friend," and who acted for him.

As one part of the case relates to the suggested identity of the claimant with Orton, it is necessary here to state that it appears that Orton was in Australia subsequently to the loss of the "*Bella*," for a receipt of his has been produced, dated, "Hobarton, 1855." It also appears that Orton was in South America before Roger left, and that he was at Mellapilla; for De Castro, a friend of the claimant, wrote to him that the person who was there bore the name of Arthur Orton, and a lock of hair has been sent from Mellapilla, which was stated to have been cut from the head of Orton, and that the person they knew bore that name. It is necessary to state these matters with reference to such portions of the evidence as relate to Orton. Those parts of the case which relate to Orton have arisen out of the claimant's acts and conduct. Thus on the 13th of April, 1865, the claimant, under the name of De Castro, addressed a letter from Wagga-Wagga to some one at Wapping, to inquire after Orton or his family. He had written, he said, several letters to him, to which he had no answers, and he wanted any information about Orton or his son Arthur. The Orton who was in Australia and in South America was Arthur Orton, and it is undisputed that he was in Australia at this time, and that he was employed at Wagga-Wagga in 1865 or 1866.

It should here be stated that in the *Home News* of 1862, which was published and read in Australia, there appeared in the list of deaths and wills that of

Sir James Tichborne, the father of Roger, and it was stated, on the assumption that Roger was dead, that the heir was the next son, Alfred. In 1863 the Dowager, who always ardently hoped for the return of her lost son, caused advertisements to be inserted in *The Times* as to his loss, mentioning the name of the vessel in which he embarked, and the date at which he sailed. The claimant, it is to be observed, had known Gibbes for two or three years, and had been in communication with him on the subject of the claim as early, at least, as July, 1865. He had been living at Wagga-Wagga since 1862, and he said he knew Mr. Gibbes for two or three years prior to June, 1866. Early in 1865 Cubitt caused to be inserted in *The Times* an advertisement of a "Missing Friends' Office" of his at Sydney. This advertisement appeared on the 19th of May, 1865, and was seen by the Dowager, who on that day wrote out to Cubitt, telling him of her son; mentioning that she had heard that part of the crew had been picked up by a vessel going to Australia, "possibly to Melbourne," but that she had not been able to get any other information. In this letter the Dowager described her son as "rather tall and thin, with very light brown hair and blue eyes," and suggested that he might have married and changed his name. She also intimated that any one giving her information about him would be "handsomely rewarded." Cubitt, in reply, suggested that "the amount of the reward ought to be governed by the importance attached to the case," and that the assurance that the lost heir was still living was a "piece of information which could not be overrated by a widowed mother." He expressed his firm conviction that her search would terminate as she desired it should, and he enclosed an advertisement he had issued, in which the heir was described as rather tall, and with very light brown hair and blue eyes, but not as "thin." Not long afterwards Gibbes wrote to Cubitt that on his return to New South Wales, after a ten years' absence, "he had just fixed his abode at Wagga-Wagga," and he wished to have further information about Tichborne, as he had "spotted him" some time ago, and could, he thought, find him. This was dated the 9th of October, 1865, and a few days afterwards Cubitt wrote to the Dowager that "his search progressed satisfactorily," giving a copy of Gibbes's letter. Cubitt also wrote at the same time to Gibbes, thanking him for his offer of gratuitous assistance. Gibbes replied in November that "if the necessary funds and something to leave behind could be got, he could send in the missing man at a very few days' notice; but he had promised not to reveal his secret before the end of March"—that is, March, 1866. Cubitt replied to this that he had already written that it was to be a "business transaction," and that there would be no difficulty in the necessary advances. In the meantime the Dowager had written to Cubitt, in warm and eager terms, that any amount of reward would be paid; and, in answer to this, Cubitt, on the 21st of December, 1865, wrote to her that her son was "alive and well." Three weeks afterwards, on the 10th of January, Cubitt wrote to Gibbes to send Tichborne, but Gibbes replied that he had left his abode, and that "he should claim the reward on behalf of the real discoverer, his wife." He also required a copy of the Dowager's letter, but this was refused; and the very next day Gibbes wrote to her himself, stating that he had prevailed on her son to put himself in communication with her, and the claimant, in answer to the jury, stated that he had seen this letter before it was despatched. Gibbes had also shown him Cubitt's

letter, and the claimant, therefore, without Gibbes's knowledge, wrote to Cubitt for information, desiring him not to let Gibbes know he had written to him, and also desiring him, as he did not wish his name or title to be known at Wagga, to write to him under the address of initials "T. C.," at the Post-office. Gibbes, not apparently aware of this, wrote to Cubitt that Sir R. T. "would not hear of any one seeing him at Wagga," and that he had himself written to Lady Tichborne, mentioning matters which would prove his identity also. The letter of the claimant to the Dowager, dated January 17, 1866, began:—

"My dear Mother,—The delay which has taken place since my last letter, dated the 22nd of April, 1854, made it very difficult to commence this letter. I deeply regret the trouble and anxiety I must have caused you by not writing before, but they are known to my attorney, and the more private details I will keep for your own ear, &c. Mr. Gibbes suggests to me as essential that I should recall to your memory things which can only be known to you and me to convince you of my identity. I don't think it needful, my dear mother—although I send them—namely, the brown mark on my side and the card-case at Brighton. In writing to me, please enclose the letter to Mr. Gibbes to prevent unnecessary inquiry, as I do not wish any person to know me in this country when I take my proper position and title. Having therefore made up my mind to return and face the sea once more, I must request the means of doing so and paying a few outstanding debts. I could return by the overland mail."

The passage-money would be over 200*l*. This was towards the end of January, and three weeks afterwards, on the 15th of February, Cubitt wrote to the Dowager, enclosing the claimant's letter to him. The letter of Gibbes to her is dated the 18th of January, and on the 25th of February she wrote to him, giving him further details. On the 18th of April Cubitt wrote to the Dowager that he had sent her the claimant's letter, that she might be able to recognize the handwriting, and that if he was the heir, there could be no difficulty as to funds; and then Cubitt wrote again to Gibbes, urging him to produce the man.—

"Things have now arrived at such a position that you must no longer remain silent, but aid me in bringing the search to a conclusion. I have promised you your share of the spoil, and as we are both interested we must both work together. I have no doubt that our efforts will be well repaid, but if you have really got the right man, both he and you must, so far as necessary for the progress of identity, throw off the mask."

To this Gibbes replied (21st of April) that Sir R. had written home, and that money would no doubt come by the June mail. To this Cubitt replied, enclosing a letter from the Dowager to the claimant, which Cubitt had received for him, and which is dated the 25th of February. In this letter she besought him to come home, and wrote:—

"You need not be afraid about the money, as the necessary funds will be found. If you go to the bankers and announce yourself as Sir Roger Tichborne they will advance the money."

Still the claimant did not come forward, and Cubitt wrote to Gibbes rather angrily that he was pressed to "advance money for the departure of some one supposed to be Sir Roger;" "but what evidence have I of this?"

On the 10th of May, 1866, the Dowager wrote to Cubitt, mentioning the

claimant's letter to her; but apparently she had not recognized him by the writing, for she says not a word about it, but, on the contrary, wrote, "I cannot say he is my son until I see him." And she does not appear to have replied to the claimant's letter. The claimant, on the 24th of May, wrote to the Dowager that he had received her note of the 25th of February:—

"I wrote to you on the 16th of January for the first time since I have been in Australia. You will wonder why I have not wrote before, but that I will tell you myself, should God spare my life to reach England. I am trying to get away by the Panama route, which leaves Sydney on the 15th of June, but I do not know whether the banker here will advance the money or not."

On the 22nd of June, the claimant being then at Sydney, Cubitt wrote to the Dowager that he had seen him. On the same day the claimant wrote to the Dowager that he had received no letter from her, and on the 24th of July he wrote again to her that he had received her letter, and was disappointed that she did not acknowledge him as her son. In August the Dowager wrote to Gibbes that she fancied the photographs sent her of the claimant were like her son, but of course, after thirteen years' absence, there must have been some difference in the shape, as Sir Roger was very slim, and she supposed the larger clothes might make him appear larger than he was. She calls him in this letter her son, but says he must come over to England to be identified. On the 2nd of September he sailed from Sydney, and Gibbes wrote that he had been identified by one Bogle, a black, who had lived in the family, and also by one Guilfoyle, an old gardener to the late baronet. Before the claimant left, he gave Gibbes draughts for 500*l*., and he had also given Cubitt a draught for a sum which Cubitt declined to disclose.

In this letter, written from Sydney, he stated that Guilfoyle, an old servant of the family, had called upon him, and knew him as soon as he saw him, but that as to Bogle, an old black servant of the family, whom the Dowager had mentioned as being in Australia, he had inquired for him, but could not find him. He did, however, find him, and Bogle, who has not yet been examined, came home with him. In this letter he enclosed a photograph of himself, but as the post was two months, the letter would not reach Paris until towards the end of September.

It should here be stated that pending the negotiations the claimant was re-married, and made his will. In January, 1866, he had married, but under the name of Castro. On the 1st of June, 1866, he made a will in the name of Roger Tichborne, which was attested by Gibbes, as his attorney, and in which he proposed to give "dower" to his wife, whom he said he had married in the name of Castro, and which contained several devices he admitted to be fictitious, and made, he said, in order to secure Gibbes. And on the 9th July he was re-married in the name of Roger Tichborne.

In September, 1866, as already stated, he sailed for England, and on Christmas-day, 1866, the claimant landed, and went to Wapping in the evening to inquire after the Ortons. Next day he went again to Wapping to inquire after them, describing himself by the name of Stephens. And then he went to Gravesend, to keep out of the way, he said, until he should see his mother. On the 28th he went to Alresford, and visited Tichborne. He then saw Mr. Hopkins, the attorney, who afterwards made an affidavit in his

favour. On the other hand, while he was at Alresford, Mr. Bowker the attorney for the family, saw him, but does not appear to have recognized him. The claimant returned to Gravesend, and, while he was there, one of Arthur Orton's sisters wrote to him, claiming him as her brother, and on the 7th of January the claimant wrote to her in a feigned hand, signing his name Stephens, and declaring that he was not her brother, but a friend of his, and he enclosed her a photograph, which he described as representing her brother's wife, whereas, in fact, it was a photograph of his own.

From a subsequent letter of the claimant's it appears that he had had an interview with Charles Orton.

While the claimant was at Gravesend, on the 6th of January, Mr. Gosford, with a relation of the family (a Mr. Plowden), and another gentleman acquainted with the family, went down to Gravesend to see him, and they caught sight of him and spoke to him, but he withdrew himself, and wrote them a note that he did not wish any one to know where "I was staying, and was annoyed to see you here." But Mr. Gosford came up with him from Gravesend on the 8th, and had a long conversation with him, as to which Mr. Gosford has not yet been examined, and the plaintiff has given his own account. Next day the claimant wrote to the Dowager, "He seems to deny every thing I put him in mind of," and afterwards Mr. Gosford stated that every thing the claimant said was untrue, but the claimant, in his evidence, stated that, in the train, Gosford "assented to every thing he said."

In a day or two the claimant went to Paris to see the Dowager, and was there ten days, returning on the 22nd of January. Soon afterwards there ensued a correspondence between the claimant's attorney, Mr. Holmes, and the attorney for the family, in which the latter declined to acknowledge him, but proposed a family meeting, which was refused. Miss Kate Doughty appears at this time to have been desirous of seeing the claimant, when he was again at Alresford, for at the beginning of February he wrote to her at that place to say he was sorry he could not come and see her, but that he was coming down again in a few days, and then he would see her. He mentioned in this letter that he was going to meet his mother, who was then coming from Paris, and lived some months with him at Croydon. She made an affidavit in his favour, in which she declared positively that he was her son, and she wrote to Sir Clifford Constable, who also made an affidavit in his favour. This affidavit was shown to several of the officers, who likewise supported him. On the 10th of February, 1867, Mr. Seymour, an uncle of Roger Tichborne, went down to Alresford to see the claimant, and the claimant afterwards heard from Mr. Hopkins (who was present on the occasion) that Mr. Seymour did not recognize him as his nephew. In March Miss Doughty, then Mrs. Radcliffe, went with her husband and Mrs. Townley to see the claimant; and there is in evidence the account given of the interview at the time in the letters of the attorneys, and in the evidence of the claimant. Mr. Radcliffe wrote at the time that they were all thoroughly convinced he was not Sir Roger, and that not only because they failed to recognize him, but because he did not recognize his nearest relations. In his own account the claimant admitted that he had addressed Mrs. Townley as his cousin Kate, but ascribed it to her being veiled. Whether he recognized them or not, it is clear that they did not acknowledge

him, for he stated in his evidence that Mrs. Townley said, "I knew my cousin well, and do not believe you are the man," and that Mr. Radcliffe also said, "I knew Roger Tichborne well, and I don't believe you to be the man," to which it should be added that the claimant said in his evidence he had never seen Mr. Radcliffe before in his life. Lady Doughty also did not recognize the claimant. An old friend of Roger Tichborne's—Colonel Greenwood—met the claimant in June, 1868, and did not recognize him. In fact, none of the relations of the family recognized him, except the Dowager and a cousin, Mr. Biddulph, and accordingly his claim was resisted, and the suit proceeded.

In June, 1867, there was an interview between the claimant and Mr. Gosford, with whom Roger Tichborne had left the sealed packet, as to which Mr. Gosford has not been examined, and of which the plaintiff has given his own account, and from which it appears that Mr. Gosford asked him to name the contents of the packet, and he declined to do so in the presence of others. Two other gentlemen were present, but though they walked to the other end of the room, the claimant did not state the contents of the packet.

It may be conveniently stated here that in the course of the suit the claimant made an affidavit that he had placed the sealed packet in the hands of Gosford, and that it related to his cousin Kate. In his evidence at the trial he stated that there were no other private instructions than those in the sealed packet. He swore at the trial that the sealed packet related to his seduction of his cousin *before* the disruption of their engagement, and that the paper dated in November, 1852, was deposited in March, 1853. It will have been seen in what language Roger Tichborne refers to his instructions as to his private wishes and intentions, and the date at which he did so, which was in January, 1852, and *after* the disruption of the engagement. Early in 1867 Carter, who had been Roger Tichborne's servant, applied to the claimant, who engaged him in his service during the whole of that year, and during the whole of that year the claimant was busy in getting affidavits in his favour to be used in the Chancery suit, especially from the officers of Tichborne's regiment, most of whom were living and were known to Carter. It appeared, however, that the opinions of the officers were very much divided on the subject, and though several of them have been called in favour of the claimant, it has also appeared that several of them failed to recognize him.

In January, 1868, the claimant saw Major Fraser, who had been adjutant in Roger Tichborne's regiment, and who failed to recognize him. It appears that Major Campbell, Major Phillipps, and Major Foster, officers of the regiment, also failed to recognize him. On the other hand, Colonel Custer, Captain Sherston, and Colonel Sawyer made affidavits in his favour—rather, however, from his knowledge of circumstances than from positive personal recognition. Mr. Scott, Mr. Biddulph, and Sir Clifford Constable also were in his favour; while Lord St. Lawrence and others were against him.

As to the trial itself, it lasted forty days before the "Long Vacation," of which more than twenty were occupied with the cross-examination of the claimant. It was not, however, until the third day that the evidence commenced, and for ten days it was continued before the claimant was called. M'Cann and Carter, who had been Roger Tichborne's servants, were called

on the 4th, 9th, and 11th days. The latter was cross-examined at great length, with a view to show that he had told the claimant circumstances that had happened in the regiment, his knowledge of which had afterwards influenced the officers. Colonel Norbury, Major Heywood, Colonel Sawyer, General Custance, Captain Sherston, Mr. Biddulph, Mr. Scott, and Sir Clifford Constable were called on behalf of the claimant, but most of them appear to have founded their evidence in his favour rather on his knowledge of circumstances than upon positive personal recognition. On the 14th day the claimant was called, and his examination-in-chief lasted three days. On the 17th day his cross-examination commenced, and was continued until the 39th—that is, for twenty-two days. The greater part of this protracted cross-examination was directed to show that the claimant could not be Tichborne, because he recollected nothing of the things Tichborne must have known, except such things as he might have been told by the Dowager, or by Carter, or by others, or might have gleaned from the letters of Roger Tichborne himself. Some portion of the cross-examination appears to have been directed to show that he is really Arthur Orton, but the great bulk of it has certainly been directed to show that he is not Tichborne, because he recollected nothing of Tichborne's life except what he might have learnt. Some of the last questions asked of the claimant related to his supposed identity with Orton, he was challenged to produce him, and he replied to the challenge by an intimation that possibly he might be able to produce him.

So stood the famous case when it was discontinued for the "Long Vacation;" and we are indebted to *The Times* for the summary that we have given.

The case was resumed on the 7th of November, from which time till the "Christmas Vacation," thirty days were occupied in the examination and cross-examination of witnesses for the plaintiff. Two witnesses from Australia were called to confirm, from their memory, the arrival of the "Osprey," in the summer of 1854, at Melbourne, having on board passengers said to have been picked up from a shipwrecked vessel; and three were called who, giving quite a different account, spoke to coming with the sailors to Melbourne in the steamer. One of these, Sharpin, spoke from memory to the plaintiff as on board the steamer with them. No entry at the Custom-house was produced to prove the time of arrival, nor were the owners of the "Bella" called, nor was there any evidence of the owners or log of the "Osprey." The persons who had made affidavits in Chancery were called as witnesses, except Hopkins and the Dowager, who were dead. The Lord Chief Justice repeatedly observed on the discrepancies between the affidavits of the witnesses and their evidence. At the trial, however, many new witnesses were called, and among these were Bogle—who had come over with the claimant, and lived with him ever since—and Moore. Among the new witnesses was a Mr. Bingley—a gentleman who saw Roger at Santiago, but never spoke to him. A Captain Sankey also was called in favour of the claimant; but it came out that the claimant took him for Captain Kellett. A Mr. Leslie, a medical man, was also called in his favour; but he had only seen Roger casually twice or thrice,—and his son, who was in the regiment, was not called. A great many witnesses were called to give their opinion as to the claimant's identity. It was shown that the claimant had a mark on

the back of his head, and a barber was called from Clonmel, who said that Roger had such a mark in the same position. Roger had been bled in the foot—the mark of such a bleeding is unmistakable and indelible. The claimant had marks on both feet which might be marks of bleeding, but might not. Roger had once a fish-hook in his eye, and there was a minute mark on one of the eyelids of the claimant which might or might not have been caused by a hook. But the surgeons could not positively say the age of these marks, and the examinations, for the most part, were made four years after the claimant had been in this country. It was proved that the claimant has a “brown mark” on his side; but it was not shown that Roger had.

Thirteen days were occupied by the examination and cross-examination, by Mr. Hawkins, of Mr. Baigent, the son of a drawing-master at Winchester, who described himself as connected by marriage with the Tichborne family. After the loss of the “Bella” in 1854, he had had repeated communication with the Dowager Lady Tichborne on the subject of her son, whom she expected would reappear some day. On the arrival in England of the claimant, he was not at first disposed to believe in him, but professed himself entirely convinced on his first interview with him of his identity, and from that time was very active in the business of promoting his claim. •

Except as to identification, and the facts relating to the “Osprey,” there was no confirmatory evidence of the plaintiff's story; neither was any witness called who had known the claimant in Australia, and who could positively prove that he was there in 1854, or at what period in that year.

On the 70th day of the trial, Mr. Serjeant Ballantine announced that the claimant's case was terminated, and the court adjourned till the 15th of January, 1872.

IV.

THE BOULTON AND PARK TRIAL.

THE trial of Ernest Boulton, Frederick William Park, Louis Charles Hurt, and John Safford Fiske, the young men charged with frequenting theatres and other places of public resort in women's clothes, was commenced in the Court of Queen's Bench, before the Lord Chief Justice and a special jury, on Tuesday, the 9th of May. Since the case was first brought before the public, Lord Arthur Pelham Clinton, who was originally included in the indictment, has died, while William Somerville, Martin Luther Cumming, and C. H. Thompson have eluded the vigilance of the police.

There was an unprecedentedly large attendance of the bar, the counsel engaged being the highest in the profession. For the Crown, the prosecutor—The Attorney-General, The Solicitor-General, Mr. H. Giffard, Q.C., Mr. H. James, Q.C., Mr. Archibald, and Mr. Poland were retained. For Boulton—Mr. Digby Seymour, Q.C., Mr. Serjeant Ballantine, and Mr. Besley. For Park—Mr. Serjeant Parry and Mr. Straight. For Fiske—Mr. Henry Matthews, Q.C., Mr. Serjeant Sleigh, and Mr. Purcell. For Hurt—Sir John Karslake, Mr. F. H. Lewis, and Mr. W. Ballantine.

The outline of the case for the prosecution was this :—For some two or three years certain persons, alleged to have been some of the defendants—principally, it was said, Boulton and Park—had exhibited themselves at public places, dressed sometimes as women and sometimes as men, and supposed by the police to be women. They were seen at the Alhambra, at the Surrey and Strand Theatres, at the Casino in Holborn, in the Burlington Arcade, in Regent-street, in the Haymarket, and at the Oxford and Cambridge boat-race. As early as 1867 Boulton was seen walking in the Haymarket with one of the defendants who had absconded, dressed in women's clothes, and with painted face. Disturbances ensued, and some of the parties were taken before a magistrate, and bound over to keep the peace. But again they were seen at various places—at the Alhambra, for instance,—where their conduct gave great offence, and whence they were three or four times turned out; nevertheless they returned again and again; and so they were seen in the Burlington Arcade, and were there also turned out. They promenaded Regent-street and the Haymarket at night until late hours in the morning, and made acquaintances. Their head-quarters appear to have been at 13, Wakefield-street, Regent-square, where they had an extensive wardrobe of female attire and female ornaments. In April, 1870, a young gentleman named Mundell made their acquaintance at the Surrey Theatre, and took them to be women. He was taken into custody with them, and was one of the witnesses for the prosecution, and the first witness called. The lodgings at Wakefield-street were searched, the female dresses were found, letters were discovered, and inquiries were made which led to the present prosecution. Lord Arthur Clinton was found to have been closely connected with them, and from the letters it appeared that other persons were implicated. It appeared from the letters that Boulton and Park had been to many places—to Chelmsford, to Devizes, to Abergavenny, to Newport, to Aberdare, and to Edinburgh, and that at some of these places they were taken for women. The letters led to the apprehension of Hurt and Fiske, the latter of whom was taken at Edinburgh, where other letters were found. In the result this prosecution was instituted. The Attorney-General remarked on the extreme sorrow he felt at being compelled to take part in such a prosecution. But he was without any choice in the matter, the revelations in the Police Courts having rendered it imperatively necessary that the public apprehensions in respect of the charges involved should be satisfied. The defendant Boulton had been for some time in the office of his uncle, who is a stockbroker in the City; and subsequently he had been a clerk in a bank. In 1866 or 1867 he renounced his post, and since then he has been without an occupation, and with but little or no means of livelihood. This last was a very important feature of the case. Park, who was the son of a Master in the Superior Courts, had been educated for the law, and was an articled clerk to a solicitor. Hurt was a clerk in the Post Office. For some time he had been quartered in London, but was afterwards transferred to Edinburgh. It must be admitted that he had always borne a most excellent character. Fiske, the fourth defendant, was an American, who had carried on business as a merchant at Edinburgh, and had acted as American Consul for the port of Leith. Having explained the general nature of the charge against the defendants, the learned Attorney-General said it would be admitted that Boulton and Park had frequently worn women's

clothes for the purpose of taking part in private theatricals, still it would be for the jury to say whether persistent conduct such as that with which they were charged could be explained away by the theory that they had been guilty of a mere foolish freak.

The previous examination began on April 29 last year, and after a month Boulton and Park were committed for trial. It appeared that Mr. Hurt was not then brought before the magistrates, nor was he charged until afterwards.

A detective who had taken Boulton and Park to the Police-station proved that they offered him money to let them go. The charge on which they were taken was that of going about in women's clothes, and he had stated this. It appeared that at the station the prisoners (Park and Boulton) said they were men, and were sorry for their folly.

At the trial a number of witnesses were examined on the part of the prosecution, their evidence being for the most part a reproduction of that taken before the police magistrate. The evidence for the prosecution closed on May 11. Sir John Karslake and Mr. Matthews, on behalf of the defendants Hurt and Fiske, submitted that there was no case against their clients, but in each instance the Lord Chief Justice declined to withdraw the testimony from the consideration of the jury.

Mr. Digby Seymour addressed the jury on behalf of Boulton :—

He urged that the Crown, by withdrawing the felony, had thrown a doubt on the value of the evidence to sustain the charge against Boulton. It would be a dangerous precedent to find the prisoners guilty on the evidence that had been produced. He hoped to be able satisfactorily to show the innocence of his client. Boulton, when a child, showed great talent in personating female characters, which won the applause and admiration of his friends and those who witnessed their delineation. That talent he encouraged; and in after years he performed female characters with great talent in private theatricals for charitable purposes. It was in the pursuit of that taste that he became acquainted with Lord Arthur Clinton and Park, and it was the circumstance of their performing so often together in private theatricals that accounted for the peculiar and familiar expressions to be found in the correspondence. The dresses and articles of wearing apparel and ornaments produced were used by them in private theatricals, and had been the accumulation of years. Folly was not crime, and culpability was not legal proof. The evidence given by Mr. Mundell was in favour of the prisoners, and it had been confirmed by other witnesses. In the course of his observations, the learned counsel said Lord Arthur Clinton was in his grave, but his name was still in the indictment; and from the stillness of his grave he appealed to and invoked the jury not to blast his memory for ever. However culpable it might be for men to go about in women's clothes, it was not for that the prisoners were now being tried. To do so might be a foolish joke—an outrage upon decency if they liked,—but there was no evidence of the conspiracy that was charged in the indictment. He would prove out of the mouths of certain actors he would produce the taste that existed for private theatricals, and the fact that it was common amongst performers to use, both off and on the stage, the language they had used when on it, and also assume the names of the characters in which they had appeared when they met or communicated by writing; and as Lord Arthur Clinton and

Boulton had performed on the stage the parts of husband and wife, that fact would account for the expressions in the letters, such as "matrimonial squabble," and the like. He would also produce the person who supplied the dresses, and give evidence of the purpose for which they were bought. He would also call the photographer, and show that Lord Arthur Clinton and Boulton were photographed in the parts they had taken in private theatricals. He appealed to the jury to divest themselves of all prejudice, and act solely on the evidence.

Mr. Serjeant Parry addressed the jury for Park.

The first witness called for the defence was the mother of Ernest Boulton. She said her husband was at present at the Cape on business.—From an early age my son showed an extraordinary taste for personating female characters. That *penchant* showed itself almost from his sixth year. Sometimes he would dress as a parlour-maid. He had done that, and even waited upon her own mamma at table without being recognized; in fact, when he left the room, she said, "I wonder, having sons, that you have so flippant a girl about you." (Laughter) My son subsequently performed in private theatricals. His taste that way was encouraged. My son and myself first met Lord Arthur Clinton at dinner at the house of a relative—a Mr. Richards, a stockbroker. Lord Arthur said he was fond of amateur theatricals, and his intimacy with my son increased very much. Lord Arthur once acted in private theatricals at my house, it was during the time that his lordship sat as member for Newark. My acquaintance with Lord Arthur continued until he died. He slept at my house at Dulwich as a guest from time to time. I called at Southampton-street on two occasions whilst Lord Arthur and my son were stopping there. My husband was with me. We had refreshments, and all went to the theatre together. The first public performance in which my son appeared was at the Egyptian Hall. He played a female and Lord Arthur a male part. My son's name appeared on the bills as Ernest Boulton. He subsequently performed at Scarborough, Brentwood, Chelmsford, Southend, &c. I was always rather opposed to his acting, but I did not actually forbid it. He had such a *penchant* for it, that I was almost compelled to give my consent. At this time he had not adopted acting as a profession. My son was successful as a singer; he has a fine soprano voice. My son left the London and County Bank owing to ill-health. I knew my son had a nickname—"Stella." Ernest was always a most devoted son, his only fault being a love of admiration, which was fed by the flattery of foolish people. I knew nothing of the Wakefield-street address, nor of their walking about London dressed as women. I made my son no stated allowance of pocket money, but I should say he had an average of about 1*l.* per week. I don't know whether the provincial amateur performances of Lord Arthur and my son were for profit. I have heard that they took money at them. I have known Mr. Hurt for three or four years. I cannot tell where Hurt was living at the time. Park, Thomas, and Cumming have visited at my house.

Many other witnesses were called, and the case ended with a verdict of "Not Guilty" against the defendants.

When the Lord Chief Justice summed up, he expressed his disapprobation of the form in which the case had been brought before the Court. "We are trying the defendants," he said, "for conspiring to commit felonious

crime, and the proof of it, if it amounts to any thing, amounts to proof of the actual commission of crime; and I am clearly of opinion that where the proof intended to be submitted to a jury is proof of the actual commission of the crime, it is not the proper course to charge the parties with conspiring to commit it. For that course manifestly operates unfairly and unjustly and oppressively against the parties concerned. The prosecution are thus enabled to combine in one indictment a variety of offences which, if treated individually, as they ought to be, would exclude the possibility of giving evidence in one case to the prejudice of defendants in others, and they are thus deprived of the incalculable advantage of being able in one case to avail themselves of the evidence of defendants in others." This view, his lordship observed, was held by Lord Cranworth. Coming to the actual facts of the case, the learned judge remarked that what had been proved against the defendants Boulton and Park was sufficient to stamp them with the deepest disgrace, although they might not have had any felonious intention. Their going, for example, to the ladies' rooms at theatres and other public places was an offence which the legislature might justly visit with corporal punishment. His lordship subsequently remarked that Hurt and Fiske should have been tried in Scotland, if at all. "It is easy, however," he continued, "to see how all this happened. The police had taken up the case, and the whole course and conduct of it confirm the opinion I have always entertained as to the necessity for a public prosecutor to control and to conduct criminal prosecutions. The police seized the prisoners' letters, and found those of Hurt and Fiske, and then went to Edinburgh and, without any authority, searched their lodgings, and then arrested them, and put them on their trial here along with Park and Boulton, without taking them before a magistrate at all, and thus they are tried with the two other defendants for an alleged offence having no connexion whatever with their conduct.

The jury took about an hour to consider their verdict, and when it was delivered there was a burst of applause in Court.

The defendant Boulton fainted on hearing the verdict.

A second indictment against the defendants for outraging decency by going about dressed as women was left to stand over, and in the meantime they were liberated on their recognizances.

V.

THE DIAMOND ROBBERY.

MARTHA TARPEY, aged twenty-eight, a married woman, was charged at the Central Criminal Court, in March, 1871, with a very remarkable crime. She was indicted for a robbery with violence from James Unett Parkes, a shopman in the employ of Messrs. London and Ryder, jewellers, and stealing from him a diamond necklace and other goods, value 2500*l*, the goods of William Henry Ryder. She was also charged with applying to James Unett Parkes chloroform with intent to assist her husband, Michael Tarpey, in robbing Parkes of the jewellery.

Prisoner pleaded Not Guilty. She appeared in the dock carrying a baby.

During the hearing of the case she was accommodated with a seat. She was pale and looked careworn.

Mr. Parkes described the robbery and assault, to which he had already deposed in the Police Court, in the following terms.—“I have been five years with my present employers. On January 12th a man, who gave the name of Tyrrell, came to Mr. Ryder’s shop and saw one of the assistants, who showed him some jewellery. He selected several articles, and, stating that he wished to make a present to his wife, requested that an assortment of jewellery might be sent to his house, No. 4, Upper Berkeley-street, in order that the lady might choose for herself. About half-past five in the afternoon I went to the address he had given with a quantity of diamond ornaments, which I carried in a small bag, and which were worth altogether between 5000*l.* and 6000*l.* The front door was opened by Tyrrell, who made some excuse for the absence of his servant. He invited me to go upstairs, and conducted me into the drawing-room. The prisoner was there, sitting by the fire. There were no chairs at that end of the room where I was. I stood at one side of the table. Tyrrell stood immediately opposite to me, and the prisoner close to him. I opened my bag and took out the five cases of diamond ornaments which Tyrrell had seen in the shop, leaving the rest of the jewellery in the bag, which I placed at my feet beneath the table. They expressed their admiration as they examined the various articles of which I told them the prices. At last Tyrrell said he should like his wife to have a necklace valued at 1100*l.*, or a smaller necklace valued at 550*l.*, with a diamond pendant worth 185*l.*, and either one or two rings valued respectively at 385*l.* and 160*l.*, and remarked to the prisoner that he thought her sister had better see them previously to their decision being made. He then asked the prisoner to call her sister. She left the room. In about two minutes I heard her return. She said her sister would be there in a few minutes. She came quickly behind me and placed a handkerchief saturated with something over my nose and mouth. As she did so the man rushed at me and clasped me round the arms, while the woman continued to hold the handkerchief in my face. I managed to get free for a minute and got the handkerchief away. The man seized me by the throat. He said nothing. The woman, getting behind me, again applied the handkerchief to my face. I began to feel a stifling sensation. The man maintained his hold of me, although I struggled to get away. In the end I was overpowered and forced down on a sofa. During all this time he did not call the woman by name. I suppose that I then became unconscious. When I came to my senses I found my arms strapped across my chest, another strap round my wrists, fastening my hands together, and a third strap round my legs. Tyrrell was standing over me. He said that if I moved he would murder me. I begged him to loosen the strap across my chest, as the pain was so great. He undid the strap and let it out by the space between two of the holes. I struggled to get myself in a sitting posture to look at the table, which was behind me, in order to see what was being done with the jewellery. Tyrrell forced me down, and tied a handkerchief over my eyes. He said if I was quiet some one would be sent to me in ten minutes. I heard him leave the room, but I did not hear the prisoner go out. Before leaving the room, he said, ‘Quick, Lucy, quick! bring my hat.’ I cannot say how long I lay there. I heard the street door slam, and directly made an effort to rise; and

when I had, with my teeth, unfastened the strap round my hands, I removed the other straps, and with the poker broke a window and called for assistance. In a few minutes some one came. The three straps produced (stout luggage straps about an inch wide) and this pocket-handkerchief were in the room. I found that the jewellery which I had placed on the table, with the exception of a small gold chain, had disappeared. The leathern cases had been left. The jewellery which I had not taken from the bag was safe. I have no doubt that the prisoner is the woman who was engaged in the robbery. She was not dressed as she is now, but in a much more fashionable style."

The prisoner's husband (described as a man of gentlemanly manners and good appearance, and well dressed) was identified with "Tyrrell" by means of a photograph.

Arthur Nicholls said that a man named Tyrrell came in January to his master's, and engaged the house in Berkeley-street. He gave a reference to an hotel-keeper at Bath, and a satisfactory letter being received in reply, possession was given him on the 10th of January. The rent was to be six guineas a week

Susan Cook: "I was sent to No. 4, Upper Berkeley-street on the 10th January as Mrs. Tarpey's cook. I was engaged on the recommendation of Mrs. Flight. I went on the Tuesday, and remained till the Thursday. On the Wednesday Mr. Tarpey came to look over the premises, and remained a short time. On the Thursday afternoon he and Mrs. Tarpey came in a cab. They had no luggage. About an hour afterwards the drawing-room bell rang, and when I went up Mrs. Tarpey gave me a letter to take to a Miss Pearson, Highfield-house, Tulse-hill. I went, but could find no such person there. On my return I found Mr. and Mrs. Tarpey had left, and that the house was in possession of the police."

Miss Pitt, Windsor-villa, Champion-terrace, Leamington, said: "In June Mr. and Mrs. Tarpey came to live at my house. On the 9th January Mr. Tarpey went to London. The prisoner had previously told me she should want to go away for a day, and she wondered if a nurse could come to take charge of the child. On the 11th January I received two telegrams for her, and she gave me, at the same time, a letter to post, addressed to a house in Oxford-street. In the evening she asked me to order a cab to take her to the station next morning. She left Leamington by the 9.40 train, and as she started she said it was just possible she might not return that evening, and if not she would send a telegram. I saw her when dressing that morning. She had on a silk dress, a jacket, a waterproof cloak, and hat, and carried in her hand a small tin box. On the evening of the 12th I received a telegram, and about two o'clock the next morning she and her husband returned. She came into my bed-room, and said they had posted from Rugby, and borrowed a sovereign for the purpose of paying the cabman. She then wore a bonnet. The next morning I noticed a little mark under one of her eyes. Mr. Tarpey had shaved off his beard, and left but a little 'imperial.' Mrs. Tarpey asked me if I thought it made him look younger, and whether he was not like a Frenchman? During the day I became suspicious, and went into their dressing-room, and, seeing a bunch of keys in the drawer of a table, I unlocked it and looked in. There were two small bottles marked 'drugs' and a little box of dye, with a brush, and a new razor, and a pocket-handkerchief. The handkerchief was near to the bottles.

Two hours afterwards I again looked into the drawer, and then found it was empty. Mr. Tarpey was in and out of the dressing-room many times during the day. I watched him all the time. When he went out he locked the door after him. On the Sunday a foreign *Bradshaw* was brought for Mr Tarpey, and on the Monday he left, but I did not see him leave. The prisoner asked me that morning if I would like to see a London newspaper. On the Wednesday evening I took tea with her, and communicated with Superintendent Lund, of the Leamington police, certain facts which led to her apprehension."

Mr. Montagu Williams submitted there was no case to go to the jury. The prisoner, undoubtedly, was a married woman, and no question would arise as to that; but he should ask his lordship whether, considering the law as defined by the different authorities, she was not entitled to an acquittal. The prisoner, to all appearance, was acting under coercion; she was, in fact, under the influence and control of her husband, and therefore was not responsible for her conduct—Mr Straight said it was perfectly clear that in cases where violence was used, the wife was equally responsible with the husband.—The Recorder: It is perfectly clear that the presence of the husband raises only a *prima facie* presumption, which is capable of being rebutted by the evidence in particular cases.—Mr. Montagu Williams: Then your lordship thinks that it must go to the jury?—The Recorder. Yes, the evidence goes to show that she was not acting under the coercion of her husband.

Mr. Montagu Williams then addressed the jury, after which the Recorder briefly summed up the case. The simple question was, ay or no, did they believe she was exercising her own free will at the time the handkerchief was applied, and was not under the control or coercion of her husband?—The jury, after a brief consultation, returned the following verdict:—"We are of opinion that the whole matter was pre-arranged by the husband, and that the prisoner acted under his coercion and control at the time."—This being tantamount to a verdict of Not Guilty, the prisoner was ordered to be discharged.

Mr. Metcalfe intimated his intention of proceeding against the prisoner for an assault and occasioning bodily harm, but the Recorder, after consulting Mr Baron Bramwell on the subject, said that he should be compelled to sum up the same way as he had under the principal charge, and therefore it would be useless, after the verdict of the jury, to carry the case further.—The prisoner was then formally Acquitted on all the charges.

This extraordinary verdict was the subject of much comment, from the absurd light in which it placed the law of marital coercion, and the wisdom of juries. Mr. Williams had got up his case triumphantly. "It would have been hard to devise," one report said, "any thing more effective than that which presented itself to the jury naturally whenever they turned to the dock. The pretty blue-eyed babe, in its frills, ribbons, and long robes of spotless white, behaving, as a stout lady remarked, 'as good as gold;' the ladylike young mother ministering to it as tenderly and unaffectedly as if she were in her nursery at home, and without a care; even the occasional offers of assistance from the female warder who sat behind, and who seemed to merge the official in the woman whenever she spoke to her charge—all made a touching commentary on Mr Montagu Williams's eloquent denun-

ciations and appeals. The jury were of the comfortable family-man type; middle-aged, respectable men of business, with the tender side to their natures coming uppermost whenever the little ones at home are thought of. The notion of a poor woman having to face a court full of men under such circumstances as environed the unhappy Mrs. Tarpey, and the manifest evidences of her affection for her infant and for her absent husband, were the very things to touch their hearts; and, when its refreshment was concluded and the tiny thing was handed with infinite care to the gaolersess who took it to her arms while Mrs. Tarpey turned her face to her judges, there was not a man among them who did not seem to think more of his own Mrs. Blank and the interesting circumstances attending her last confinement, than of Messrs. London and Ryder's jewels or the punishment to be awarded to their thief. Robbery with violence, and an infant at the breast; deep and nefarious plotting, and the honest trusting eyes of babyhood; the administration of a noxious drug, and a fair young mother's innocent pride in her first darling—the things seemed so incongruous as to be incompatible, and some shrewd observers shook their heads knowingly when the baby was transferred and its mother's face was seen. A determined mouth with the under jaw extending beyond the upper, and closing firmly; a long upper lip; rounded cheeks, and a clear complexion; a well-shaped nose, with just sufficient upward tendency to be piquant; large blue eyes, the deeply-rooted sadness of which did not destroy their beauty; ears, with openings which are too large for symmetry, and which protrude too much from the head for grace; and a broad full forehead so deeply lined as to be almost wrinkled—such was Mrs. Tarpey as she appeared at her trial. She kept her seat in the front of the dock during the whole of the proceedings, and this brought her chin to the level of its front; while her trim figure, in its blue cloth jacket and tippet of fur, and her ungloved shapely white hands, filled up a personal portrait which made a strange contrast to the deed of violence with which the prisoner was charged. Mr. Montagu Williams, in his successful endeavours to exonerate the wife, abused the husband in good round terms, and at each of his accusations the prisoner had shaken her head in indignant denial. When the verdict was given Mrs. Tarpey looked even sadder than before; and the applause which came from the people in the body of the court appeared to frighten her. Then came a temporary delay, while the Recorder consulted Mr. Baron Bramwell, and then a ladylike little figure is observed to nimbly follow a woman and a baby down the steps at the back of the dock, and that is the last seen of the acquitted Martha Tarpey."

The acquittal of Mrs. Tarpey, however, led to the arrest and conviction of her husband. After the trial she dyed her hair black and went about dressed in mourning; but the police watched her to a house in Marylebone-road, where Michael Tarpey was discovered and detected, in spite of shaved whiskers.

On being put on his trial he pleaded Guilty, and was brought up for judgment on May 2.

Mr. Williams stated that the prisoner had given information to Messrs. London and Ryder, by which a quantity of the stolen property had been recovered.

Mr. Straight said that Mr. Ryder had recovered about 800*l.* worth of the diamonds that were stolen from him. As to the rest, information had

certainly been given with regard to the places at which they had been sold, unquestionably very much below their value; but they had been disposed of in a foreign country, and were not likely to be recovered. He had already stated that the prisoner was in great pecuniary difficulty in consequence of his having been engaged in betting transactions. It also appeared, from a statement that had been made, that the prisoner and his wife had been reading some work of fiction in which a robbery of this sort was described. They at first ridiculed the notion of such a thing, but it grew upon them, and they then projected and carried out this scheme. The prisoner, since his apprehension, had had what he (the learned counsel) might call the audacity to apologize to Mr. Ryder for making him the subject of the robbery, which, he said, was originally intended to be committed upon Mr. Harry Emmanuel. There were two packets of diamonds found, one containing twenty-four and the other thirteen. There was also a diamond found sewn up in the waistband of the prisoner's trousers, and when asked what it was put there for, he said he had intended to give it to his wife.

The Recorder, addressing the prisoner, said—"You have pleaded guilty to the indictment charging you with robbery, and the prosecutors have not thought it right to proceed with the indictment which charged you with administering a drug with a view to render the person robbed insensible. I have, therefore, only to deal with the indictment to which you have pleaded guilty. The circumstances of that case as disclosed show that it was a carefully and artfully prepared plan to rob a tradesman of a considerable amount of property, and a robbery that was attended with a certain amount of violence, in order to enable you to succeed in your object. The sentence of the Court upon you is that you be kept in penal servitude for a term of eight years."

VI.

THE TRIAL OF EDMUND POOK.

On the 12th of July, Edmund Walter Pook, Printer, was brought up for trial at the Central Criminal Court, before Chief Justice Bovill, on the charge of wilfully murdering Jane Maria Clousen on the 25th of April.

The girl was found lying nearly dead of terrible wounds in a lane near Eltham, in Kent, by a policeman, on the morning of the 26th. It was ascertained that she had recently lived as servant in the family of a Mr. Pook, a stationer, at Greenwich, and the suspicions of the police were directed to his son, Edmund Walter Pook, as having been concerned in the murder. The girl was taken to Guy's Hospital on the 27th, and lingered in an insensible state till the 30th, when she died. She had been unable to give any clue to the murderer. It was ascertained in the hospital that she was two months advanced in pregnancy.

At the close of a long inquiry before the Coroner, a verdict of wilful murder had been found against Edmund Pook, who was arrested, and, after examination at the Greenwich Police Court, committed for trial.

The Solicitor-General, with Mr. Poland and Mr. Archibald, prosecuted on

behalf of the Crown; and Mr. Huddleston, Q.C., with Mr. Harington, Mr. Beasley, and Mr. Straight, defended.

The Solicitor-General, in opening the case, described the particulars of the murder, and the grounds for the charge against the accused. He pointed out that on the 27th of April a hammer, with marks of blood on it and some hair, was found on the grounds of Morden College, near where the girl was murdered, and it was an important fact that going by these grounds from the place of the murder would be the shortest way to the prisoner's house. A hammer of a sort similar to that found was purchased at the shop of a person named Thomas on the previous Monday. He observed that the prisoner was a young man given to flirtation (innocent flirtation, it might be) with young ladies in the neighbourhood of Greenwich. On the Sunday previous, the 23rd of April, he had been taking a walk with two young ladies, and, in so doing, had walked over the very ground which it was suggested was passed over by himself and Jane Clousen on the night of the murder. He had also sent a message to another young lady to meet him on the Thursday night following, giving as a reason that on Monday and Tuesday night he was engaged to sing at some place of amusement—St. Alban's Hall—in London. On Monday and Tuesday night he was not in London, which was a circumstance of considerable suspicion. Among other young ladies with whom the prisoner was intimate was Miss Alice Durnford, of Lewisham. He was keeping company with her without the knowledge of her parents, and used to make appointments with her in various ways. It was not an unfrequent thing for him to give a signal to her from a shrill metal whistle. On the 26th April, after Jane Clousen had been discovered, a whistle was found sticking in the mud about fourteen or fifteen yards from the place where the crime was committed. No doubt there were hundreds of thousands of whistles of the kind about London, but when the prisoner was searched no such thing was found. If it was true that the prisoner had it, and now had it not, it was for the jury to say what weight they would attach to such a circumstance. He called attention to the circumstance that blood had been found on the wristband of the prisoner's shirt, and that upon one of the knees of the prisoner's trousers there was found a human hair about six inches long. The learned counsel then drew the attention of the jury to the position in which the prisoner and the murdered girl stood to each other. She was seventeen years of age, and a pretty girl, had lived in Mr. Pook's service, and was two months advanced in pregnancy. At this time he was carrying on an intimacy with two young women. To one of these, Alice Durnford, he wrote a letter after his apprehension, informing her that he had been taken in custody for the murder of that Eltham girl, but that the charge was almost too ridiculous to mention. On this account he could not keep his appointment with her, but hoped to be out on Tuesday to do so. He considered the expression an extraordinary one under the terrible circumstances of the case.

Evidence was given by Police Constable Gunn of his finding a respectably-dressed young woman lying, as before described, in Kidbrooke-lane, between four and five in the morning of the 26th. He had passed through the lane the same night between one and two o'clock, and had noticed nothing particular. Deceased only ejaculated, "Oh, my poor head!" and afterwards, when he offered to help her, "Let me die!" and never spoke again. He

saw a little blood on the ground, and marks of footsteps on the grass around. Police Constable Hayne had found a locket among the deceased's clothes, which, accompanied by a man called Humphreys, he took to Mr. Randall, a silversmith, in Greenwich.

Dr. Harris, of Guy's Hospital, deposed to having attended the deceased in the hospital, and described the nature of her wounds; he had ascertained that she was pregnant. He thought that the hammer which was found near the spot, and which was produced in Court, would be a likely instrument to inflict the wounds of which the deceased died.

Fanny Hamilton said the deceased had come to lodge with her about ten days before her death. She was frequently low spirited. They walked together into Deptford on the evening of the murder, and parted in the High-street, about a quarter before seven o'clock.

Police Inspector Mulvaney was examined and cross-examined at length concerning a visit which he had paid, accompanied by Superintendent Griffin, at Mr. Pook's house, to arrest the son, on the 1st of May. He mentioned the object of his visit to the father, who denied having any suspicion of intimacy between his son and the deceased. Edmund Pook, when asked to produce the shirt he had on that night, at first said he believed it had gone to the wash, but, on being pressed, he went to look, and returned with it. There were marks of blood on the right wrist-band, for which he accounted by certain scratches on his arm. It was pointed out to him that the scratches were on the left arm, he said he supposed the blood must have dropped from one arm to the other when he was washing his hands.

Police Superintendent Wills had received a metal whistle, which had been picked up in the neighbourhood of the murder on the 26th.

Evidence was given by several persons of the prisoner, or some one like the prisoner, having been seen buying a plasterer's hammer at the shop of a Mrs Thomas on the evening of the 24th. The testimony of one of these witnesses, Perrin, a comic singer, was very much shaken on cross-examination. The man who bought the hammer seems to have worn a dark coat and light trousers.

Other respectable witnesses, one of whom identified the prisoner, swore to seeing a man and woman walking together through Kidbrooke-lane, about half-past eight on the evening of the 25th. Screams and scuffling, as of people in play, had been heard soon after, and a man came running by dressed in a dark coat. One witness heard the woman say, "Let me go"—he thought she added, "Charley." He saw the man, who had a dark coat and billeycock hat, take the woman by the shoulder, and push her in the direction of Morden College.

Alice Durnford was accustomed to 'walk' with the prisoner, and knew he used a bright metal whistle.

Ellen Plane, a confectioner, said he came into her shop on the evening of the 25th, between eight and nine, to get his clothes brushed.

Louisa Billington confirmed this, and added the prisoner said he could not brush off all the mud, but would sponge off the rest. She saw no mud on his clothes—it was a dry night.

Other witnesses saw him that night, about nine o'clock, looking hot and excited, returning to Greenwich.

Thomas Layell, a gardener, saw the prisoner at ten minutes before seven, on the evening of the 25th, near Morden College, with a young woman. He told a serjeant of police that a man had picked up a handkerchief on the following morning and shown it to him: it had blood on it. Correcting himself, witness said it was a kind of duster, not a handkerchief.

Police Serjeant Wills corroborated his statement; he had the duster at the station, but thought the stains were not blood.

The Lord Chief Justice said that this had come out for the first time, and commented severely on the conduct of the police in not having called attention to the circumstance before.

Superintendent Griffin said the rag was more like part of the lining of a woman's dress.

Dr. Lethely examined the prisoner's clothes, and found a human hair on one of the trousers, which corresponded in colour and texture with a lock of hair he had received from Mulvaney, and with the hair which was sticking to the hammer. He saw seven small spots of blood on the trousers, and a little on the hat and wristbands, but could not date them.

Other facts that came out in the case for the prosecution were that Pook had alleged an engagement to sing on the 25th (he often performed in public), and that he accounted for having lost his moustache on the 30th by saying it had been cut off to act a comic part; that he had said he was going to London on the 24th and 25th, and on the morning of the latter day had made an appointment with Miss Durnford—to whom he was known to be paying his addresses—for the 27th, while in his defence he said he had gone into Lewisham, on the evening of the 25th, to meet her.

For the defence, testimony was given by Ebenezer Pook, the father, to the girl's general good character. He said his son was subject to fits, when the blood would come from his tongue by his teeth biting it. His elder brother, being on a visit at home, had slept in the same room with him for the last three weeks. On Tuesday evening he had gone into Lewisham to see a lady. He never wore dark clothes. He said that Inspector Mulvaney, on his visit to witness's house to arrest the prisoner, had stated that his son had been on terms of intimacy with the deceased, and had given her a locket, and that there was a note in his handwriting to the girl: all which his son had denied.

T. Burch Pook, the brother, swore to having been with the prisoner nearly the whole evening of the 24th, and that he never entered Mr. Thomas's shop that evening.

Harriet Chaplin, a cousin staying in the house, said the prisoner was at home at seven, and again at a quarter to nine, on the 25th.

Edward Mackenzie, a fireman, noticed the spots on the wristband on the *morning* of the 25th.

A printer named Collier, in the employ of Mr. Pook, spoke to prisoner's having tied up the hand of a boy who had cut himself some time in the month of April.

Several witnesses spoke to the excellent character of the prisoner.

Mr. Huddleston argued, on behalf of the prisoner, that the evidence of some of the witnesses for the prosecution was unworthy of belief. It could not have been the deceased that Layell saw in the lane, for he fixed the time at ten minutes to seven o'clock, and it was proved beyond a doubt that she

was at Deptford at a quarter to seven that evening, and it was a distance of three miles from Deptford to the place where the body was found. The learned counsel, after accounting for the blood-stains on the shirt, severely blamed the police, who, he said, had evidently left no stone untuned to convict the prisoner. They had ransacked the very dregs of Greenwich for evidence, and to find such a man as Perrin. It appeared to him that while doing this they had neglected to follow the real clue that might have led to the detection of the actual murderer. He referred at considerable length to the evidence as to the *alibi*, and he urged that it went conclusively to show that the prisoner was at Lewisham at the time the murder was alleged to have been committed, and that he could not have been the murderer.

After the Solicitor-General had replied on behalf of the Crown, the Lord Chief Justice, in summing up, also commented on the misconduct of the police in bringing forward some worthless witnesses, as well as in concealing at first the discovery of the bloody rag, which his lordship considered a most important ingredient in the inquiry. In his opinion the police had also gone much beyond their duty in not only questioning the prisoner, but in making false statements to him; and this had clearly been done by Inspector Mulvaney. That a most barbarous and cruel murder had been committed there could be no doubt, and the police appeared to have acted under the impression that the murder was committed by some one by whom the poor girl was in the family-way, and who, on that account, wished to destroy her, but he felt bound to say he could not discover a tittle of evidence to show that any familiarity had existed between the prisoner and the deceased, and that this alleged motive on his part for the commission of the crime had entirely failed. The police, however, had chosen to assume that there had been an intimacy between the parties, that there had been a correspondence between them, and that the prisoner had given her a locket; and although there was nothing to support either of these suggestions, the police had gone on acting upon the supposition that they had actually existed, and this erroneous opinion appeared to have formed the foundation of their proceedings. A very important question for their consideration was at what time the murder was committed, the evidence being that at two o'clock in the morning the Police Constable- Gunn, had passed the place, and at that time nothing was seen of the deceased, and nothing was seen of her till four o'clock. If the murder was in point of fact committed between two and four o'clock, the prisoner could not have been the murderer, because it was shown that he was at home at nine o'clock, and that he remained in his father's house until the following morning. The learned Judge then proceeded to read over the whole of the evidence, and, with reference to that portion of it relating to the finding of the blood upon the prisoner's clothes, he said he certainly could not help thinking that the murderer of the deceased must have received a much more considerable quantity of blood, and he said it was for the jury to consider whether the prisoner had not given a reasonable account of the mode by which he received this blood.

The Judge concluded his summing-up at a quarter to nine, and the jury then retired to consider their verdict. They returned at five minutes past nine, and gave a verdict of "Not Guilty." The announcement was received with loud cheers, which were immediately taken up by a large crowd outside the Court.

At Greenwich a strong party feeling arose both for and against the prisoner and his family. Mr. H. Pook, the solicitor for the defence (who, though of the same name, was not related to the prisoner), applied for a summons against Superintendent Griffin and Inspector Mulvaney for perjury, but it was not granted. Some of the leading gentlemen of the place formed a committee to provide for the expenses of the defence, and offered a reward of 200*l.* for the discovery of the murderer, but no further clue was found. The solicitor for the defence took legal proceedings against Mr. Newton Crosland and Mr. Frederick Farrah, on charges of libel for certain pamphlets published on the case; but the grand jury in October threw out the bills.

VII.

THE TRIAL OF FLORA DAVY.

THE trial of Hannah Newington, otherwise called Flora Davy, for the manslaughter of Frederick Graves Moon, was commenced at the Central Criminal Court before Mr. Baron Channell on the 13th of July. Mr. Giffard prosecuted; Mr. Serjeant Parry and Mr. Henry James, Q.C., defended. The prisoner, who was described as a married woman, had been living for some years past under the protection of Mr. Moon at No. 23, Newton-road, Westbourne-grove. On the evening of the 24th of May last they dined together; after the dinner was removed, a basket of clean knives was left in the room. About ten o'clock an alarm was raised, and upon persons going into the room it was discovered that Mr. Moon had received a wound of which he died shortly afterwards. The prisoner gave one or two different explanations at the time as to how the affair happened, and said that "she was afraid she had done it." She afterwards gave a more detailed statement, and said that the deceased had made use of some insulting expressions to her, of which she complained, and told him not to repeat them, but he did so, and attempted to throw a bottle at her. She struggled with him, and having a knife in her hand at the time, the stab was inflicted by accident. The prisoner appeared to have all along asserted that she had no intention to hurt the deceased, and she also stated that she was unable to say how the affair had actually happened. It was proved in evidence that very shortly before the fatal occurrence took place, the prisoner and the deceased had quarrelled, and the prisoner had threatened that she would one day or other stab him; to which he appeared to have replied that it was not her fault that she had not done what she threatened before, as she had attempted to do so. Mr. Serjeant Parry, who defended the prisoner, read some letters addressed to her by the deceased, in proof of the affectionate terms they were on together, and, arguing that the agonized state of the prisoner after the death of Mr. Moon was incompatible with the theory of the prosecution, he asked the jury to accept the occurrence as accidental. After Mr. Giffard had spoken in reply, the learned Judge proceeded to sum up. He said no fair or sound view would warrant them in coming to the conclusion that the wound was caused by the premeditated act of the prisoner, but if it was the consequence of an infirmity of temper, she must bear the consequences of the act she had committed. His lordship then referred at length to the position of the rooms in the Newton-

road, to the circumstances that took place immediately before the alleged offence was committed, and to the nature of the wound. The jury, after deliberating half an hour, found the prisoner guilty. The prisoner made vehement protestations of innocence, declaring that the wound was made during a struggle between herself and the deceased for the possession of the knife, and that she immediately tried to stop the bleeding. Baron Channell, in passing sentence, said that he entirely approved of the verdict found by the jury. "I cannot doubt myself," he added, "that you were the cause of the death of the deceased without any lawful excuse. In the fact that you did take his life unlawfully are all the elements necessary to make you guilty of this charge. The question of punishment rests for the Court, and that is a great and serious responsibility. It is manslaughter of a very serious kind. I cannot doubt, and I am sure the jury have not doubted, that you resorted to that basket, took the knife in your hands, and armed yourself with it, to encounter the deceased, although I feel you may not have anticipated the awful consequences that ensued. I will assume in your favour that there may have been some irritating observations; but the public safety will never be secured if in a quarrel of this kind one of the parties is to be allowed to resort to so deadly a weapon with impunity, although it may not for the moment be intended to be used in the way it is afterwards used. It is to me a matter of painful anxiety to know what course I ought to take in the sentence I am about to pass. There is no doubt that there was something like provocation on the part of the deceased, and that it was under the influence of excited feelings thus brought into action that this unhappy event occurred. The sentence of the Court upon you is that you be kept to penal servitude for eight years." The prisoner covered her face with her hands while Baron Channell was addressing her; and when he had finished she fainted, and had to be carried away.

VIII.

THE TRIAL OF KELLY.

THE trial of Robert Kelly for the wilful murder of Head Constable Talbot was opened at Dublin on the 30th of October, before Lord Chief Justice Whiteside and Lord Chief Baron Pigott. There was great unwillingness to serve on the jury, and it was not until the close of the first day that the requisite number of jurors could be obtained. The prisoner was escorted to the court by two troops of dragoons, as well as a large body of police.

The main facts of the case were as follows.—About midnight on the 12th of July, as Talbot was walking in a street in Dublin, a man sprang from a doorway and fired a revolver at his breast, the bullet passing through the breast to the back of the neck. Talbot was taken to the Hospital, where he was attended by Dr. Stokes, M.C.S., physician to the University of Dublin Hospital, and some other eminent surgeons, and died at the end of a few days. The murderer, after firing the shot, retreated into the doorway, from which the prisoner Kelly was immediately afterwards seen to run away. In his

retreat he fired a bullet from a revolver at a policeman who was in pursuit of him, and hit him in the thigh. Kelly was however arrested, and was identified by Talbot before his death as the man who had fired at him.

The Solicitor-General and Serjeant Armstrong were counsel for the Crown, Mr. Butt, Q.C., and Mr. Falkiner, Q.C., for the prisoner.

The Solicitor-General, in opening the case, said that its importance could not be overrated. The prisoner stood charged with the wilful murder of Head Constable Talbot, and the circumstances aggravated, if that were possible, the gravity of the crime. Two constables, Mullan and Grimes, identified the prisoner as the man who fired the shot. The revolver, a neat six-chambered weapon, was produced in court. A police inspector proved the finding of three bullet moulds in the prisoner's house on the 12th of July. The words "Colt's patent" were engraved on one of the moulds. The chief interest of the trial lay in the examination of Dr. Stokes and the other medical witnesses, as the line of defence on which Mr. Butt mainly relied (in addition to the question of identity, which he maintained was not proved,) was that Talbot's death was owing, not to the wounds he had received, but to unskilful surgical treatment. Dr. William Stokes was accordingly examined and cross-examined at great length as to his treatment of the wound. He said he had had the advice and assistance of Mr. Robert William Smyth, Professor of Surgery in the University of Dublin; Mr. John Hamilton, of Merrion-square; Mr. Robert Adams, of St. Stephen's-green; Mr. Joliffe Tuffnell, ex-Regius Professor of Military Surgery to the Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland; Mr. Porter, Surgeon-in-Ordinary to the Queen in Ireland, and ex-President of the Royal College of Surgeons; and Dr. Robert M'Donnell. He denied that the vertebral artery was cut during the man's lifetime, and was asked, "Why can you tell me that it was not cut during his lifetime?" To which he replied, "For three reasons: First, if that artery had been cut the hæmorrhage would have been enormously profuse; secondly, if it had been cut it would have been impossible to apply a ligature to it at that situation; and thirdly, the effect on the patient's brain by the sudden withdrawal of the blood would have been obvious and manifest to every one present." He admitted that the occipital artery had been cut during the operation which he performed. It was ligatured; five or six minutes elapsed before the artery was tied up, but there was no loss of blood, for pressure was put on. He described the first examination of the wounded man. The action of the heart and his pulse were not weak. There was no symptom about him at that time to lead the witness to believe that his life was in danger. He probed the wound, which was not bleeding when he first saw it. He then used a forceps, and felt a hard substance, which he believed to be a bullet, and tried to get hold of it, but there were small pieces of metal impacted into the suture, and no forceps could get any hold on them. The forceps struck the bone. Talbot showed no sign of weakness while he made the examination.

The next time he was seen by several other surgeons, who used the probe. He was subsequently removed from the bed to the theatre of the hospital, after a conversation with the other surgeons; the light was between them. The witness enumerated successive probings. He did not recollect Dr. M'Donnell stating that what was supposed to be a bullet was a bone. Dr. Baxter lent him a Nélaton probe, which is of porcelain, and determines with

more certainty the presence of a foreign body. The result was not satisfactory. Although the mark of the lead was not on the probe, the witness was sure that it was. The witness was pressed as to the details of the operation and the several kinds of foreign and other instruments used in the effort to extract the bullet. He stated that if the wound had appeared mortal it would have been useless to attempt to move the lead. Independently of the wound itself, he showed no symptoms involving danger to life. He first showed dangerous symptoms on Thursday, when he found there had been hæmorrhage. It was stopped, but returned on Sunday. He stated that when the artery was cut, the blood did not spout. His depositions at the inquest were referred to, and the word was found in them. He did not recollect having used it.

In the course of the cross-examination Mr. Butt asked:—"According to the rules laid down by the best writers on surgery, was it proper to have made the operation to search for that bullet?"

The Solicitor-General objected—not that he was afraid of the answer, but because he knew they were to have the opinions of other medical men. He gathered from his learned friend last night that he was about going into evidence as to whether the operation was necessary or not, and, if so, as to whether it was properly performed. He was of opinion that this question was improperly introduced into the case. Even assuming that the treatment was the cause of death, he maintained that it was sufficient for the prosecution if the wound inflicted was a dangerous one according to the opinion of competent men. It had been proved that this was a dangerous wound. There could be no doubt that Dr. Stokes was a competent medical man—his qualifications showed that—qualifications which were none the worse because of their being from an Irish college and university. That being so, and he having been brought to attend this man, and having attended him according to the best of his skill and ability, it was not possible or competent for his learned friend (Mr. Butt) to go into any questions as to the opinions of other medical men. He submitted that this evidence ought not to be admitted, and he thought they had now arrived at a point in the case where their lordships should intervene.

Mr. Butt contended that the evidence ought to be received. The indictment here was not for firing at with intent to kill—if it was, the evidence would be inadmissible; but the indictment was for actually killing, and the question the jury would have to try, even assuming that the prisoner fired the shot, was whether or not the operation was improper, and whether the operation caused the man's death, and not the wound.

The Lord Chief Justice here asked Mr. Butt whether his evidence was to establish a case of manslaughter, or to raise a mere question of medical or surgical skill?

Mr. Butt, with great respect, declined to answer a question as to whether they intended indicting the witness for manslaughter. Distinctly he meant to show that Dr. Stokes "violated every rule of surgery in performing the operation." Mr. Butt added—"I intend to produce persons who were present at the operation—some of whom the witness has named as parties assisting him—who are men of greater eminence than he is, and to show that any operation to extract the ball that night was contrary to every rule of surgery under the circumstances, was highly dangerous to the life of the man, was

calculated to lead to his death, and did lead to that death." He cited authorities in support of his proposition, and said he intended to offer evidence to show that the operations were unnecessary—that they were contrary to good surgery—and that they occasioned the hæmorrhage which resulted in death. He insisted on his right to give this evidence to the jury, who were the supreme tribunal to determine the question at issue.

Their lordships were absent from court for an hour consulting, and when they returned, rejected the evidence proposed to be given on behalf of the prisoner, but allowing (the Lord Chief Justice expressing dissent) evidence that the operation was unskilfully performed.

The surgeons who had acted with Dr. Stokes in his treatment of the deceased were next examined, and after them the resident pupils of the hospital, who had assisted in the operations. One of them, Mr. Vesey, produced his notes of Talbot's illness, but it was elicited that these did not agree with his "note-book," in which the entries were made from hour to hour as the symptoms of the patient were discerned. He was sent to the hospital for this book, and on further examination admitted that, along with Mr. Walker and Mr. Woodhouse, two other pupils, he had "revised" his notes, that they might all agree. This revision took place after the inquest on the body had begun, and when it had been ascertained that a legal question would arise as to the propriety of the surgical treatment.

After Mr. Parkinson, gunmaker, and Mr. Leadbetter, silversmith, had been examined with regard to the bullet extracted from one of the No. 7 Ely cartridges, and the fragments found in Talbot's body, which they pronounced to be both of the same description of lead, Mr. Butt proceeded to speak for the defence.

He dwelt particularly on the alteration of their notes by the hospital residents, and alleged that this was done to shelter Dr Stokes. The speech was long and earnest, and ended with an appeal to the jury against being "swift to shed blood." Mr Butt said: "The issue of fact, of which the jury were the judges was—Did Kelly kill and murder Thomas Talbot? That on the night of 1st of July last, Thomas Talbot was wounded by a pistol ball there could be no question whatever. To sustain the charge contained in the indictment two things were necessary. Thomas Talbot must have been killed by a pistol shot, and that shot must have been fired by the prisoner. For the defence they said that he was not killed by the pistol shot, and further that there was no evidence that the prisoner at the bar fired that pistol shot." Having quoted from Brougham's speech in defence of Queen Caroline, as a justification for his free handling of Dr. Stokes, he continued:—"They had heard the examination of last Saturday. He conducted that examination with pain—he looked back upon it with regret; but there was not a man in the box who did not know that alterations were made in the record of the transactions in the hospital, and that these alterations were made with a view to screen those who had conducted the operations upon Talbot. If he had had the notes of Mr. Vesey when he had cross-examined Dr. Stokes, that cross-examination would have assumed a very different form. If the facts were correct, Dr. Stokes would not have stated that it was not a piece of reckless surgery to conduct the operation as he had done. The man when brought to the hospital was weak from loss of blood and shock to the system.

What did Dr. Stokes do under the circumstances? What did he do, without asking one word from those medical assistants who would have told him that they thought ten minutes previously that the man was dying? The first thing he did was to probe the wound and cut it. If he placed Mr. Vesey's notes before any surgeon in the world, and asked him, was it reckless to probe and cut the man's neck when he appeared to be dying ten minutes before, he would say it was reckless in the extreme. What terrible light was thrown upon this by the notes of Mr. Vesey, which set forth that the man had to be lifted on to the table, seemed very weak from loss of blood, and had to be given stimulants—ammonia, whisky, &c. He 'seemed very weak from loss of blood.' This was omitted from the revised notes. Why? It was omitted after the inquest. Was it when it came to be known that the accusation would be made that Dr. Stokes caused the man's death?"

A second discussion followed between the judges and the counsel with regard to the admissibility of the surgical evidence as to the cause of death, at the close of which the Lord Chief Baron said the Court would not allow a discussion to be raised on the question of the skill used in the operation, and the Lord Chief Justice, concurring, said, "If the wound was mortal the whole inquiry into the judiciousness or injudiciousness of medical treatment would be futile. That was settled law."

Mr. Falkner, Q C, then addressed the jury on behalf of the prisoner, contending that the cause of death was the treatment in the hospital. After a passage of arms between the Chief Baron and Mr Butt, Sergeant Armstrong replied on behalf of the Crown, telling the jury that they would have nothing whatever to do with the question of the operation in the hospital. If the prisoner fired the shot which caused Talbot's death, he would be guilty of murder.

On November the 10th the Lord Chief Baron charged the jury. He said the law provided that in every trial for homicide the cause of death should be shown to the tribunal. For this purpose the coroner's inquest is to be held immediately after the commission of the alleged offence. Having stated that it was their duty to give the prisoner the benefit of any reasonable doubt, still it was a solemn obligation on them also to inquire into all the circumstances and weigh the evidence carefully, and not to act on a mere doubt, which might only amount to a fancy of the possibility of innocence. The law did not define what was reasonable, but left that to the common sense of the jury—such common sense as they would apply in the ordinary affairs of life. The Court had felt bound to lay down a rule as to the law of the land on an important question in the trial, namely, that he who inflicts a dangerous wound is responsible for the consequences, whether death was caused mediately or immediately by the wound so inflicted. As that was the law, and after hearing a great deal of the investigation, the Court had felt bound to reject any evidence by which it was proposed to prove that death was occasioned by mistake in determining the operation, or in the process of it. There had been some misrepresentation respecting the words *bona fides*, as if the absence of *bona fides* meant *mala fides*. That, indeed, did not form part of the prisoner's defence, and if it did it would be absolutely extravagant, upon the evidence, to say that there was any wicked design on the part of Dr. Stokes, or those who assisted at the operation, to effect the death of Talbot by unskilful treatment in the progress of the operation.

He then proceeded to the identification of the prisoner by Talbot himself, and asked what motive Talbot could have had to make a false statement when he believed he was dying. As to the theory that the pistol had changed hands, it was highly improbable, almost impossible.

The jury, after examining the pistol and bullets, with the pieces of lead found in the body, as well as the map of the locality in which the murder was committed, returned a verdict of *Not Guilty*. The prisoner was remanded, in order that he might be tried on the charges of firing at the policeman Mullan, and of assaulting the two constables, Moony and Shannon. The Commission opened on December 6th, when the grand jury found true bills against Kelly. The trial was, however, postponed, in consequence of an application from Mr. Butt, on the ground that a number of publications had been circulated in the city and county of Dublin, especially among the jurors, which were calculated to prevent the prisoner from obtaining a fair trial.

In connexion with this trial, which caused great excitement at the time, and was the subject of free comments both in the English and Irish newspapers, we may mention the case of Richard Pigott, proprietor of the *Irishman* newspaper, who was charged with having published, during Kelly's trial, a scandalous and malicious libel, calculated to interfere with the administration of justice. Chief Justice Whiteside said that the article was one of a series published with the same intent. The lesson sought to be impressed on the readers of the *Irishman* was the hideous, impious, and blasphemous one that the man who shot an informer was not alone no criminal, but a hero worthy of honour. That doctrine, if believed in, would render the trial they had gone through a mockery, and its tendency was to hand Dublin over to the government of bowie knife and revolver. The articles were meant to defeat justice, to blacken the character of witnesses, to intimidate jurors, and to make law impossible. The Court therefore sentenced Mr. Pigott to four months' imprisonment.

IX.

THE "AGINCOURT" COURT MARTIAL.

In our Chronicle for July was recorded the stranding of the "Agincourt" near Gibraltar. A Court Martial for the trial of the officers belonging to the vessel was opened on July the 26th, on board the "Royal Adelaide," at Devonport. The charge was as follows:—

"For that they, the said Henry Hamilton Beamish, Charles Edward Bell, and John Ellis Knight, then being persons subject to the 'Naval Discipline Act (1866),' and belonging to her Majesty's ship 'Agincourt,' did, on the 1st day of July, 1871, negligently strand the 'Agincourt' on the Pearl Rock."

The following officers composed the Court:—Admiral Sir H. J. Codrington, K.C.B., Commander-in-Chief at Devonport; Rear-Admiral Edmund Heathcote, Senior Officer on the coast of Ireland; Rear-Admiral W. H. Stewart, C.B., Superintendent of Devonport Dockyard; Captains Lord John

Hay, additional to the "Royal Adelaide;" Charles Fellowes, C.B., "Indus;" Hon. F. A. C. Foley, "Cambridge;" E. H. G. Lambert, "Iron Duke;" W. G. Jones, "Impregnable"; and T. P. Coode, "Royal Adelaide," Mr. William Eastlake, Deputy Judge-Advocate of the Fleet; Mr. Fegen, paymaster, R.N., barrister-at-law; Mr. R. W. Ford, solicitor, of Portsmouth, defended Captain Beamish.

After letters had been read from Vice-Admiral Wellesley and Captain Beamish to the Admiralty, reporting the disaster, Lieutenant MacFarlane, Commander Boyle, and some of the seamen gave evidence as to the manner in which it happened. Two leadsmen proved that deep water was under the vessel till just before she struck. Rear-Admiral Wilmot attributed the accident to want of proper attention and care on the part of the officers. He said that when he left the deck he was not aware of the vessel's proximity to the shoal, nor was the subject of the Pearl Rock alluded to by any of his officers. Admiral Wellesley said that judging before the result, he considered the whole squadron would have gone wide of the Pearl Rock. Had the navigating officers taken repeated crossbearings they must have seen the ship was not steering the prescribed course. He thought the "Agincourt" was perfectly in her station. Lieutenants Bearcroft and Littledale, of the "Minotaur," gave the opinion that the "Agincourt" was two cables out of the stream at the time she grounded. Lieutenant Brackenbury believed she could not have been really out of the stream. Captain the Hon. Carr-Glynn, of the "Warrior," said he thought the course ordered from the "Minotaur" risky, and that it had been given under a misapprehension, but did not think it right to signal his apprehensions, the course having been changed three times. Staff Commodore Mayo, of the "Warrior," said he saw the "Agincourt" was steering right on the Pearl Rock, and considered the accident due to the Admiral's not having led the squadron with his usual prudence.

On the 7th the prisoners read their defence. Captain Beamish pointed out that perfect station was maintained by the "Agincourt," that he was constantly on the bridge, and that he had at no time sufficient apprehension of danger to justify his signalling to the Vice-Admiral, although he remarked that the course was unusually close to the Pearl Rock, much closer than he himself would have steered. When the ship struck he was below consulting the doctor, because his state of health required it; but he had no reason to believe that any precautions were relaxed. When the "Agincourt" had struck every thing possible was done to clear her. Nothing had occurred to weaken the natural presumption that the leading ship would navigate the fleet with safety. After referring to the Admiralty sailing directions for the coast of Spain, the prisoner said "that from some cause, probably the jealousy of former Spanish Governments and their unwillingness to allow English surveying officers to land on their coasts, no English surveyors or hydrographers are directly responsible for any part of the sailing directions relative to that portion of the Straits of Gibraltar with which this inquiry is concerned. These directions are certainly a compilation only from certain Spanish works, on referring to which it would be found that they differ in minor but material points in the directions for avoiding the Pearl Rock. Moreover, he submitted statements, made by residents on the spot, that there are outlying shoals not marked on any chart. Further, it would be seen that the 'Agincourt' fell into

the race of the tide running round the Pearl Rock, of which there was no opportunity of obtaining any estimate or warning."

Lieutenant Bell, in his defence, urged that he had no misgivings as to the safety of the ship, and that his other duties prevented his paying strict attention to the navigation, which he left to the proper officers.

Staff-Commander Knight pleaded that he was not a free agent, being guided by the flag-ship. The "Agincourt" was in her station until carried out of it by the current running round the Pearl Rock, and which would have carried the ship a cable and a half out of her station, unperceived, within three minutes. At the time of striking they were looking for the two beacons represented on the plan as marking the Pearl Rock, but, as it subsequently turned out, they were too much overgrown with brushwood to be properly seen. He had full confidence in the orders of the "Minotaur." He attributed the disaster chiefly to the misdirections given in the sailing directions, and pointed to his service of twenty-five years and his hitherto stainless character.

The prisoners handed in excellent testimonials, and called several witnesses to prove there was no negligence.

The Court, after deliberating for two hours, gave the following judgment:—"Having heard the evidence in support of the charge, as well as what the prisoners have offered on their behalf, and having maturely and deliberately weighed and considered the same, the Court is of opinion that as regards each of the said prisoners the said charge has been proved, but, considering the attending circumstances under which the 'Agincourt' was then being navigated, the Court only adjudges the said Captain Beamish and the said Staff-Commander Knight to be severely reprimanded and admonished to be more careful in the future; and the Court only adjudges the said Lieutenant Bell to be admonished to be more careful in future and the said Captain Beamish and the said Staff-Commander Knight are hereby severely reprimanded and admonished, and the said Lieutenant Bell is hereby admonished."

The Lords of the Admiralty subsequently published a Minute, in which it was stated that their lordships were satisfied, from perusal of the evidence taken before the court-martial, that all the material facts connected with the stranding of the "Agincourt" were fully brought out, and that no further inquiry was necessary. They considered that the stranding of the ship was occasioned by great negligence on the part of other officers as well as those who had been tried. They were of opinion that the primary cause of the disaster was clearly the unsafe course steered by the squadron, in obedience to signal from the flag-ship of Vice-Admiral Wellesley. It was also Rear-Admiral Wilmot's duty to have informed himself of the position of the ships in his division with reference to any danger in their course, and to have exercised a watchful care to keep them clear of such danger. Had Rear-Admiral Wilmot paid more attention to the navigation of the ships under his immediate orders, he would not have suffered his flag-ship, leading the star-board division, to run on shore on a well-known shoal, in broad daylight, when the land and marks for clearing the shoal were distinctly visible. Their lordships therefore, though with great regret, superseded both these officers from their command. Staff-Commander Kiddle, the senior navigating officer of the flag-ship, was deprived of the pilotage of the Channel

squadron, and placed upon half-pay. Upon the conduct of the officers tried by the court-martial, their lordships passed no further comment. The Minute concluded by expressing the approbation of their lordships of the conduct of the officers and men of the squadron for their exertions in lightening and rescuing the "Agincourt," with an express notice of the skill exhibited by Captain Lord Gilford in rendering the assistance of the "Hercules."

X.

THE "MEGÆRA" COURT MARTIAL.

A COURT MARTIAL was opened on November 9th, on board H.M.S. the "Duke of Wellington" in Portsmouth Harbour, for the trial of Captain Thrupp, and the officers of Her Majesty's iron steamship "Megæra," accused of having caused the stranding and loss of that vessel off St. Paul's Island on the 19th of June, 1871. Vice-Admiral W. Loring, C.B., presided, and the other members of the Court were Captains Hancock, "Duke of Wellington;" Rice, Aide-de-Camp to the Queen, "Asia," and Steam Reserves at Portsmouth, Boyes, "Excellent," Gunnery Establishment and Superintendent of the Naval College, Waddilove, "Inconstant," Aynsley, "Monarch," Graham, "Immortalité," Richards, "Jumna," and Colme-Seymour, "Volage." Mr. Martin, paymaster of the Royal Yacht "Victoria and Albert," barrister-at-law, officiated as Judge-Advocate, and Commodore Dowell, C.B., appeared, by permission of the Court, as the friend of Captain Thrupp.

A short account of the disaster was given in our Chronicle for August. A despatch from the Acting Lieutenant of the vessel, Mr. Jones, to the Admiralty, dated Batavia, August 7th, gives the following particulars. "On June 8th, on the voyage from the Cape to Sydney, a leak was reported in the vessel, but was for several days kept under by hand-pumps and baling. About the 14th of June the leak became more serious, and the water gained on the pumps. Steam was then used and by the aid of the main steam pumps the water was kept in check. It was then determined to steer for St. Paul's Island, where she arrived and anchored on Saturday, June 17th. On examination of the vessel a hole was discovered worn through the centre of a plate, about 12 ft. abaft the mainmast and about 8 ft. from the keel, port side, besides other serious injuries in the immediate vicinity of the leak. On the 19th of June, the weather being very stormy, and it being impossible to keep the ship in position, it was determined to beach her. At about one p.m. the ship was run full speed on to the bar, and remained there. She soon afterwards filled up to the main deck aft at high water. The ship was not entirely abandoned for about ten or twelve days after she was beached."

At the opening of the Court, Captain Thrupp read a narrative of the circumstances attending the loss of the ship, adding that he had no complaint to make against any of the officers or crew. He said, in describing the position of the leak, that the water came into the ship in the same manner as it comes from a fire-plug in the street. When he decided to run to St. Paul's his intention was to examine the vessel and stop the leak, for he had then no idea that it would be necessary to land his crew. But after the frequent choking of the

steam bilge-pumps with the pieces of iron, and in the face of the examinations made, not only by himself, but by other officers, it would not have been safe to go on for a single day. Mr. Weston, Admiralty chemist of Her Majesty's Dockyard, Portsmouth, pronounced the supposed piece of iron handed into the court by Captain Thrupp as having been pumped up by the bilge-pumps, to be not iron, but peroxide of iron—simply rust. Mr. G. Mills, chief engineer of the "Megæra," read a statement he had prepared of facts attending the ship's loss, which corroborated the evidence given by Captain Thrupp. On examination, after minutely describing the pumps used on board the "Megæra," he stated that the leak was discovered to have been caused by the eating away of the plates by corrosion. Eleven places were found on the inner surface of the ship's bottom plates, near the leak, and the iron there was so thin that it "gave" outwards under the pressure of the hand. Witness passed his fingers through the hole in the plate where the leak was, and found the edges of the iron sharp and thin, and easily to be bent back. A patch of india-rubber and boiler-plate was prepared and put over the leak on the inside, and braced on as far as it was prudent to use strength in doing so, but the water came in afterwards from under the india-rubber nearly as fast as before the patch was put on. The hole of the leak was about two inches long by a little over one inch wide, and appeared like a larger hole in the centre, with two smaller ones, at the sides of the aperture eaten into one. The appearance of the ship's bottom was of such a nature that a lever was not allowed to be used to screw up the brace for fear of causing further injury to the plate, and the brace was only screwed tight by hand. No other means were tried to stop the leak from the inside, owing to the weakness of the plates there. He would not have recommended Captain Thrupp to have continued the voyage to Australia in the "Megæra" with her plating in the state it was known to be at and near the leak, and the probability of other bad places in the ship's bottom plating, under any conditions. He believed the damage to the plating at the leak to have been caused by galvanic action from a copper rose and pipe leading through the ship's side from a hand-pump. He was not aware of any other part of the ship being defective except the plate in the vicinity of the leak. In his opinion no means at the disposal of the ship could have made her fit to undertake the remainder of the voyage with any chance of safety.

Mr. Nathaniel Barnaby, President of the Council of Construction of the Navy, stated that the "Megæra" had been refitted in the year 1865 at the cost of 27,400*l.*, and had again been taken in hand at Woolwich in the following year. In 1870 another examination was made, and the bottom of the vessel was found to be very thin in many places; the vessel was, however, reported ready for service for one year at least. So far as the witness knew, the results of the survey were not communicated to Captain Thrupp or any of the officers; but they were told by the Admiralty instructions to take great care that the paint and cement were not allowed to get off. On being asked if he could account for the bottom having been "pitted" in some parts, Mr. Barnaby said that the ship was in constant peril of having a hole worn through the bottom, where the cement did not exist, from the wash of bilge water, to say nothing of the galvanic action of copper in its neighbourhood. When asked whether the survey of April, 1870, was so thorough as to be quite satisfactory as to the ship's seaworthiness, Mr. Barnaby declined to give an

opinion. George Bridges, the carpenter of the "Megæra," in the course of an examination as to the measures adopted after the leak was discovered, said.— "From my experience as a shipwright and my knowledge of the ship's bottom, nothing more could be done than was done to make the ship seaworthy and enable her to continue the voyage. From my own knowledge and the reports of the engineers I do not believe the ship was seaworthy and fit to go on to Australia." Joseph Peters, foreman of the fitters in Sheerness Dockyard, and William Owen, Assistant Master-Shipwright, gave evidence respecting the repairs of the vessel. James Alexander Bell, the diver on board, reported that on his examination of the hull the day before the vessel was stranded he found the plate round the leak so thin that he could easily have made the leak large enough to admit his shut hand by breaking away the edges. He thought that in six or eight days the hole would have become four times the size. Edward Brown, chief engineer of the "Blanche," a passenger on board the "Megæra," considered the ship most unseaworthy, from the defective plates. Nothing could have been done to enable her to proceed on the voyage from St. Paul's with safety. Mr. Trickett, inspector of machinery at Devonport, and who was at Woolwich in 1866, described the condition of the ship at the time of the survey made in that year. She was then, after the repairs, fit for eighteen months or two years of temporary service. Alexander Brown, the leading stoker of the "Megæra," who found the leak, said that the sea came in "like a water spout, rushing up against a plate of iron the height of the girders." The Court then, after a short adjournment, intimated that they required no further evidence. If Captain Thrupp wished to make a statement, or to call witnesses, he was at liberty to do so. Captain Thrupp said he should prefer to have some time for consideration, and on the following day, November 18th, he read to the Court the following statement:—

"Before making any remarks on the loss of the ship, I wish to be allowed to state, that on the 'Megæra' leaving Queenstown on the 14th March, 1871, neither I nor (that I am aware) any of the officers or ship's company had any knowledge that the bottom of the ship was in any way weak or likely to leak. She was a newly-commissioned ship, just out of dock, where her bottom had been cleaned and fresh coated, the defective bobstay and ports had been made good, and the ship had been lightened of 100 tons of cargo, so that we had every reason to be satisfied with all that had been done to remedy our defects, and I so expressed myself to the Admiral commanding before leaving that port. On the leak first breaking out it was true that I was as near the Island of Mauritius as St. Paul's, and if I had then had any idea of danger, it is probable that I should have at once hauled up for the former place; but I had none whatever. It was not until four days afterwards finding the leak did not proceed from a rivet hole, but was of a more serious nature, that I decided on calling at St. Paul's to examine the bottom and stop the leak. It was only after the divers had examined the ship's bottom, and the frames were found so defective, and I had further inspected the weak places myself, that I fully realized our position, and for the first time discovered the impossibility of continuing the voyage, and then it was of course equally impossible to proceed to the Mauritius. I did not at that time enter minutely into the question as to whether the plates became defective by the use of any particular cement or the absence of cement, or whether it arose from galvanic action. My anxiety was centred in discovering what the

extent of the damage was, and in slowly realizing to myself the fact that it would be impossible to proceed on the voyage without the most imminent danger."

After entering at some length upon the evidence with regard to the pumps, and stating that it was not a deficiency of pumping power, but the extreme weakness of the ship in the neighbourhood of the leak that induced him to decide as he did, he concluded by saying — "I wish to state, on behalf of the officers and men who have returned with me, that I have always considered myself solely responsible for the step I took in beaching the 'Megæra,' and I feel it my duty to express my great satisfaction at the conduct of the whole of the officers and crew under the very trying circumstances in which we were placed. It was mainly owing to their exertions that, under Providence, there was no more serious casualty. I think, sir, it would be unnecessary for me to call any further witnesses, and I am willing to leave my case in the hands of this Court."

After due deliberation, the finding of the Court was "that Her Majesty's Ship 'Megæra' was stranded on the Island of St. Paul on the 19th day of June, 1871, by her Captain, Arthur Thomas Thrupp, but that, taking all the circumstances of the case into consideration, the said Captain Arthur Thomas Thrupp was fully justified in beaching the ship, and that he would not have been justified in continuing his course to Australia, and doth therefore acquit him of all blame in respect to it. The Court is further of opinion that no blame whatever is attributable to the other officers and men under trial hereinbefore named for the stranding and loss of Her Majesty's ship 'Megæra,' and doth therefore acquit them of all blame, and the said captain and other officers and men are hereby acquitted accordingly."

The President rose from his seat, and taking up the sword which lay before him, handed it back to Captain Thrupp, whom he addressed in the following words:—"Captain Thrupp, I have great pleasure in returning you your sword." Captain Thrupp, in receiving the weapon, thanked the President, who then declared that the court was closed.

A Royal Commission was subsequently issued to the Right Hon. Lord Lawrence, the Right Hon. Abraham Brewster, late Lord Chancellor of Ireland; Admiral Sir Michael Seymour, G.C.B., Sir Frederick Arrow, Deputy Master of the Trinity House; Mr. Rothery, Registrar of the High Court of Admiralty; and Mr. Thomas Chapman, F.R.S., Chairman of the Committee for Lloyd's Register of British and Foreign Shipping, and a Vice-President of the Institution of Naval Architects, directing them to inquire into and report upon the state and condition of Her Majesty's late ship "Megæra" when selected for her recent voyage to Australia; the circumstances under which she was despatched from this country; the extent and cause of the leak subsequently discovered in the ship, and of any other defects in the ship's hull at the time when she was beached at St. Paul's; also, as far as may be deemed expedient, the general official history of the ship previous to her said voyage, and her classification at successive dates. The Commission held their first meeting on the 7th of December in a committee-room of the House of Commons, but adjourned on the 21st till the 8th of January, 1872.

APPENDIX.

PUBLIC DOCUMENTS AND STATE PAPERS.

I.

THE BELGIAN TREATY BETWEEN ENGLAND AND PRUSSIA.

(Signed at London, August 9th, 1870; Ratifications exchanged at London, August 26th, 1870.)

ARTICLE I.

HIS Majesty the King of Prussia having declared that, notwithstanding the hostilities in which the North German Confederation is engaged with France, it is his fixed determination to respect the neutrality of Belgium, so long as the same shall be respected by France, Her Majesty the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland on her part declares that, if during the said hostilities the armies of France should violate that neutrality, she will be prepared to co-operate with His Prussian Majesty for the defence of the same in such manner as may be mutually agreed upon, employing for that purpose her naval and military forces to insure its observance, and to maintain, in conjunction with His Prussian Majesty, then and thereafter, the independence and neutrality of Belgium.

It is clearly understood that Her Majesty the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland does not engage herself by this Treaty to take part in any of the general operations of the war now carried on between the North German Confederation and France, beyond the limits of Belgium, as defined in the Treaty between Belgium and the Netherlands of April 19, 1839.

ARTICLE II.

His Majesty the King of Prussia agrees on his part, in the event provided for in the foregoing Article, to co-operate with Her Majesty the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland,

employing his naval and military forces for the purpose aforesaid, and, the case arising, to concert with Her Majesty the measures which shall be taken, separately or in common, to secure the neutrality and independence of Belgium.

ARTICLE III.

This Treaty shall be binding on the High Contracting Parties during the continuance of the present war between the North German Confederation and France, and for twelve months after the ratification of any Treaty of Peace concluded between those Parties; and on the expiration of that time the independence and neutrality of Belgium will, so far as the High Contracting Parties are respectively concerned, continue to rest as heretofore on the 1st Article of the Quintuple Treaty of the 19th of April, 1839.

ARTICLE IV.

The present Treaty shall be ratified, and the ratifications shall be exchanged at London as soon as possible.

In witness whereof the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed the same, and have affixed thereto the seal of their arms.

Done at London, the ninth day of August, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and seventy.

(L.S.) GRANVILLE
(L.S.) BERNSTORFF.

A similar Treaty between England and France was signed on the 11th, and ratified on the 26th August at London.

II.

DIPLOMATIC CORRESPONDENCE UPON THE
FRANCO-GERMAN WAR.

THE Diplomatic Correspondence so anxiously expected (says the *Times*, of Feb. 14) has now been issued. It forms a volume of 260 pages, and we hope to render our readers a service by presenting them with an analysis of it. The papers now published range from the beginning of August to the conclusion of the present Armistice. The earliest despatches from our Ambassador at Paris describe the stormy scenes in the French Chambers which followed the disasters at Woerth and Spichenen. Lord Lyons states on the 12th of August that the universal feeling even then was that a further defeat would be absolutely and immediately fatal to the dynasty, while it was by no means considered certain that even the success of the army in the field would suffice to avert a revolution.

The first point of importance relates to the engagements entered into for the general maintenance of neutrality. It appears from a despatch of Lord Granville to Lord Lyons on the 16th of August that "several Powers, since the beginning of the war, had proposed that a combined neutrality should be formed of all the Neutral Powers." Her Majesty's Government, however, "had always objected to any formal compact, although expressing their desire to exchange freely ideas which would tend to circumscribe the War or which would lead to any prospect of Peace." The Italian Government seems to have been the most anxious for some such mutual understanding, and in answer to their renewed suggestions Lord Granville replied that he still objected to any formal engagement, but that, if the Italian Government wished to interchange an assurance that Great Britain and Italy would not depart from their neutrality without announcing to each other their intention, he was ready to do so. This proposal was accepted, and assurances were accordingly exchanged between England, on the one hand, and Italy, Austria, Russia, and other Powers. The Russian Government hastened to close with this proposal, and even anticipated the proceedings of England, observing that "the general concert thus established among them would greatly increase the moral influence which the neutral Powers would be entitled to exercise in any Conferences which might take place for the establishment of Peace."

Count Beust desired, on the part of Austria, to render this mutual engagement more extensive. He said on the 23rd of August he would be ready to agree to the proposal, "on the condition that the Powers did not act separately in the future work of mediation between France and Germany." Eventually Count Beust waved his reservation, and exchanged the common form of assurances. The Spanish Minister subsequently inquired whether it was intended that this exchange of Notes should be "effected solely between England and the other Powers, or whether those Powers should also do so among themselves?" Lord Granville replied that Her Majesty's Government would be glad to see carried out the latter interpretation, but did not wish to press their views upon any one of the Powers.

The Prince de la Tour d'Auvergne presided at the French Foreign Office during the brief Ministry of Count Palikao, and a despatch from Lord Lyons, dated the 16th of August, gives important information respecting the attitude of the French authorities at that critical moment. He said the French Government had no objection to an understanding between the Neutral Powers, for he believed them all to be well disposed towards France. At the same time it was evident that "under present circumstances France could listen to no offer of mediation from any quarter." She had no reason to despair, and she could not treat while she had the means of continuing the war on equal terms and driving the Prussians out of France. There were two conditions which he regarded as indispensable under all circumstances—namely, "the preservation of the integrity of the territory of France and the maintenance of the dynasty."

Lord Granville, in reply, authorized Lord Lyons to assure the French Minister "that he does right to count on the friendship of England," and although Her Majesty's Government had certainly no intention or desire to obtrude their mediation either on France or on Prussia, the Prince might be assured that "if at any time recourse should be had to their good offices, they would be freely given and zealously exerted." This elicited from Prince de la Tour d'Auvergne, in a conversation with Lord Lyons, a repetition

of his previous language, and he added that, speaking for himself only, he would say that "if signal success should attend the French arms he would be very moderate," and would only urge that with the concurrence of Europe some settlement should be made which would obviate the antagonism between France and Prussia which had led to the war. Russia at this moment showed a disposition "to prepare for an offer of mediation," though Prince Gortchakoff appeared to be conscious that the time had not yet arrived. Lord Granville, in a despatch of the 17th of August to our Ambassador at St. Petersburg, says Her Majesty's Government are convinced that any suggestion of the kind would be now disregarded by the two belligerents, and "this would make it a matter of greater delicacy and difficulty hereafter for neutral Powers who might be anxious to exert themselves for the restoration of Peace." Prince Gortchakoff, in reply, expressed "his entire concurrence in this view of the case." Count Beust on the 11th of August told Lord Bloomfield he had been informed of Lord Granville's anxiety "to profit by the first opening to suggest propositions of Peace to France and Prussia." He expressed his desire to aid in establishing an understanding among the neutral Powers for this purpose; but "at present he saw no chance of entering upon any negotiations with either belligerent," and he added "that if fortune continued to favour the arms of Prussia as it had done up to the present moment, he apprehended there would be no expectation of treating of Peace until the German armies were under the walls of Paris." Italy, however, towards the end of August, again came forward in the matter, and a despatch from Lord Granville to Sir A. Paget, on the 27th of August, lays down the position which the Government continued consistently to maintain.

Russia at this time betrayed considerable anxiety to be, at all events, prepared for interposition; but Prince Gortchakoff at length expressed to Sir A. Buchanan his entire concurrence in the opinion of Lord Granville, that neither France nor Prussia desired interference.

On the 6th of September M. de Lavallette left the French Embassy at London in the charge of M. Tissot, and from this moment the diplomatic relations between England and the belligerent Governments became completely changed. Henceforward Lord Granville is incessantly solicited by the French authorities, in one form or another, to interpose by making propositions to Prussia. As early as the 7th of September Lord Granville sends a despatch

to Lord Lyons in answer to the first of these applications, and here, again, Lord Granville states the position he consistently maintained in the future. M. Favre had told Lord Lyons that France would certainly agree to an Armistice if a neutral Power were to propose it, and that he would be glad for an offer of mediation to be made to Prussia on the basis of the integrity of the French territory. But Lord Granville replied, as usual, that more harm than good would be done by attempting to mediate unless there were reasons to believe that both parties would receive such mediation, and unless there were a basis which both would accept.

On the 8th of September M. Tissot communicates to Lord Granville the Circular of the 6th of September, in which M. Jules Favre formally announces the resolution of the Government of National Defence to yield "neither an inch of our territory nor a stone of our fortresses." Meanwhile it appears that M. Jules Favre had been exerting himself in other quarters to bring mediatory influence to bear upon Prussia. It is evident he was most anxious to avoid the tremendous responsibility of carrying on the conflict, and was prepared to do almost any thing provided it would not be inconsistent with his epigrammatic programme. On the 8th of September Lord Granville informs Baron Brunnov of M. Favre's desire for the proposal of an Armistice by a neutral Power, while stating that "the maintenance of our territorial integrity is still an absolute condition for us," without which we have determined to "carry on a war *à outrance*."

M. Jules Favre promptly accepted Lord Granville's offer to transmit any communication which might tend to Peace, and on the 9th of September Prince Metternich brought to Lord Lyons a letter from M. Favre, requesting that the following inquiry might immediately be conveyed to Count Bismarck:—"Is Count Bismarck willing to enter into verbal negotiations for an Armistice and for a Conference upon the conditions of Peace, and with whom does he propose to hold this conversation?" This was instantly forwarded; but the circuitous communications occasioned by the war entailed considerable delay in its transmission, and Lord Lyons had no little difficulty in inducing M. Favre to wait patiently for a reply. Meanwhile the French Minister repeated his instructions to M. Tissot to urge on Lord Granville that "it was important for the common interest of all that the British Cabinet should unite with other Powers in order to bring about the signature of an Armistice which might serve as a preliminary towards the con-

clusion of Peace;" and Lord Granville again replied that it was not desirable to offer mediation "until there seemed to be a basis on which both parties would consent to negotiate." Similar observations are exchanged on the same day between Lord Lyons and M. Favre himself; but M. Favre remained dissatisfied with Lord Granville's attitude, and on the 10th of September he directed M. Tissot to express the value he would attach to "a more active co-operation on the part of the Cabinet of London;" he said that public opinion in France looks for this co-operation, and "has been painfully affected on learning that England, amid the cruel trials which her most faithful ally is undergoing, hesitates to take a more decisive step."

In the midst of this restlessness and anxiety the mission of M. Thiers was announced on the 12th of September. On the 13th of September Lord Granville reports to Lord Lyons that M. Thiers asked for no forcible intervention, but appealed to England to exert her moral influence to obtain peace. He urged that England "belonged to Europe," and if she would only take the lead, all neutral nations would follow, and it would be impossible for Prussia to withstand the moral force of such a public opinion. Lord Granville replied that England had done more than she had a right to do, in the hope of preventing the war. Her advice had been disregarded, and she could not now interfere until a basis of negotiations, mutually acceptable to France and Prussia, was apparent. Lord Granville also suggested that it was worthy of M. Favre's consideration whether he should not at once negotiate the conditions of a Peace and not of an Armistice; and he urged the importance of obtaining a regular Government by means of a Constituent Assembly. In a third interview M. Thiers asked whether, if Russia were to take the initiative in addressing Germany in favour of France, England "would not object to be left behind?" Lord Granville replied that England felt no jealousy of other Powers in such a matter.

Let us now return to M. Favre. On the 13th Lord Granville received and forwarded to Paris Count Bismarck's answer to M. Favre's question. The following was the telegram Count Bismarck sent to Count Bernstorff in reply:—

"September 12, 1870.

"Already said in previous telegram that you are to meet every overture of the Queen of England, but cannot attach to the overtures of the Government now acting in Paris the importance of an overture of the Government of France, because it is not yet recognized by France, and the

Emperor Napoleon is still formally, for foreign Powers, the bearer of the sovereignty. I answer by the counter question—What guarantee can the present Government, or one of those which will probably follow it in Paris, give that agreements with it would be recognized by France, or even immediately only by the troops at Strasburg and Metz?"

M. Favre replied as follows:—

"The guarantees justly required by Count Bismarck can be given in a twofold respect—political and military. From the political point of view the Government of the National Defence will sign an armistice, and call in an Assembly without delay, which will ratify the Treaty of Peace to be concluded between the Prussian and the French Government.

"From the military point of view the Government of the Defence affords the same security as a regular Government, inasmuch as all orders of the War Minister are obeyed. Whatever in this respect would be settled by means of an armistice would, therefore, without delay be punctually carried out."

But M. Favre's eagerness had already outrun these despatches. He entertained the idea of going himself without delay to the German head-quarters, and Lord Granville, if he did not suggest this course, cordially supported it in his language both to M. Thiers and to Lord Lyons. On the 13th of September Lord Lyons tells Lord Granville it was the intention of M. Jules Favre to go to Count Bismarck himself, and "to say frankly and fully that the Government did not shut its eyes to the results of the campaign," and was prepared, in short, to yield "almost any thing, provided the integrity of the territory be preserved."

Meanwhile, to appease M. Favre's anxiety, Lord Lyons had sent Mr. Malet through the French lines to insure the first of M. Favre's communications reaching Count Bismarck's hands. A short answer which Count Bismarck addressed to Lord Lyons is remarkable for a statement somewhat inconsistent with an assertion he afterwards made in his account of the interview of Ferrières. "Confidentially," he says, "*I beg leave to inform your Excellency that we shall always be ready to enter into negotiations for peace but not for an armistice.*" M. Favre carried away the impression that Count Bismarck expressed a similar objection to an armistice in conversation with him, but this was denied by Count Bismarck. The question is more than once suggested in the course of these Papers, how far the idea of an armistice was at any time before the fall of Paris agreeable to the Prussian authorities.

The mission of Mr. Malet was opportune. On the 19th of September, M. Favre told Lord Lyons that, if Her Majesty's Government would not deem it discourteous, he "would sacrifice all personal pride and reserve," and if the answer of Count Bismarck to his last message were longer delayed, set out for the Prussian headquarters without waiting for it. Mr. Malet was able to state that Count Bismarck had said, "If the French Government wish to treat they should send some one to do so; we will treat with any one they send." Of the negotiation which ensued two narratives were published by M. Favre and Count Bismarck.

Meanwhile Count Bismarck had issued his circular from Rheims, in which he publicly declared the intention of the German Government "to push back the French frontier on the south-west, and thereby the starting point of the French attacks," and to seek "to acquire for Germany the fortresses with which France threatens us, so as to make of them bulwarks of defence." This circular was officially communicated by Count Bernstorff to Lord Granville, and it is important to observe that Lord Granville asked "whether any expression of opinion on the contents of the Circular was invited by the Prussian Government," and the reply was in the negative. The Prussians maintained throughout a similar indisposition to invite the opinion of England or of any other Power, and this attitude seems materially to have affected Lord Granville's course.

On the 25th of September M. de Chambord, who now represented M. Favre at Tours, called on Lord Lyons to urge that "the time was come for the formal recognition of the present Government of France by Great Britain." He represented that the Government was now universally acknowledged and obeyed, that it was the only possible Government in France at the present moment, and that to recognize it would enable Her Majesty's Government, without in the least departing from neutrality, to establish a claim to the gratitude and sympathy of the French nation.

Lord Lyons referred the matter to Lord Granville, who contented himself for the moment with approving a reference Lord Lyons had made to the language used in the interviews with M. Thiers. But, on the 1st of October, he reported to Lord Lyons that the Cabinet fully sustained his views with respect to the recognition of the French Government.

In answer to M. Cadoina, Lord Granville again expressed the opinion that "there is no means at present by which the neutral Powers can accelerate the

conclusion of peace." On the same day M. de Chambord, after discussing with Lord Lyons the divergencies between the statements of Count Bismarck and M. Jules Favre, expressed the opinion that "the best course would be for the neutral Powers to ask Count Bismarck what his conditions really were," and he said M. Jules Favre represented that the pretensions of Prussia were now avowed to be such as it was manifestly impossible for France ever to submit to. "He felt he was entitled to appeal to the rest of Europe for support. *The time for good offices had passed. The Powers should now speak to Prussia in a tone which could not be mistaken, and take measures to ensure their being listened to.*" In a despatch of the 4th of October, Lord Granville, after a review of the course hitherto pursued by the Government, states explicitly that they are not prepared to support by force any representations they might make to Prussia, and that they must await some more favourable moment for interposition.

It is quite lamentable to read the almost frantic cries for help which the French authorities uttered. One day M. de Chambord read to Lord Lyons a despatch from M. Jules Favre "commenting with some bitterness upon what the writer termed the abandonment of France by the Cabinets of Europe, and containing a positive order to make a distinct demand for armed aid (*concours arme*) upon Italy." At this point we again hear of M. Thiers. He himself sent by telegraph an account of his reception at St. Petersburg. M. Thiers, it appeared, expressed very great satisfaction with the reception which he had met with from the Emperor and the imperial family, from Prince Gortchakoff, and other men in high office, as well as from the society in general. He had found public opinion alarmed by the progress of Prussia, and extremely well-disposed towards France. The Emperor and Prince Gortchakoff had expressed themselves warmly against the enforcement by Prussia of any exorbitant terms of peace, and had declared that Russia would never give her sanction to any conditions which were not equitable; and that, consequently, the sanction of the other Powers would also be withheld, and the exactions of Prussia would be simply the effect of force, and would rest on no European foundation.

On the 10th of October Lord Granville writes to Lord Bloomfield at Vienna a report of a communication which Count Apponyi had been instructed to make to him on the expediency of mediation between France and Prussia, and on the views with regard to it entertained by the

Austro-Hungarian Government. Count Beust said that for special reasons it was impossible for Austria to take the initiative; but he was distressed at the "torpor" of Europe, and he thought England and Russia might move. Lord Granville adhered to his ordinary language on the subject.

On the 1st of October Count Bismarck issued from Ferrières the short despatch to Count Bernstorff in which he combated the statement of M. Favre that "Prussia means to continue the war and to bring France back to the position of a Power of the second rank." We refer to it here because in the course of it he distinctly mentions that the acquisition of Metz was included in "the general outlines" of the conditions of peace which he had sketched to M. Favre, and had indicated in his circular of September 16, dated from Meaux. He speaks of "*the cession of Strasburg and Metz, which, in accordance with those ideas, we are striving for*"

On the 11th of October Lord Granville addresses a brief despatch to Lord Lyons, in which he ventures further than he had yet done in offering advice to the French. He instructs Lord Lyons, if an opportunity should arise, to point out that Her Majesty's Government are of opinion that "the rigid adherence by M. Favre to the conditions of yielding not an inch of territory nor one stone of a fortress is a great obstacle to peace."

On the 5th of October M. de Chaudordy, at Tours, again returned to the subject of the intervention of the neutral Powers. He said.—

"It was possible there were terms upon which France and Prussia might agree if they were proposed and insisted on by the united voice of Europe, but which neither Power was in a position to propose to the other."

It was at this critical moment, when it was still hoped that the elections for a Constituent Assembly would be held, and the question of Peace or War decided by France herself, that M. Gambetta appeared at Tours, bringing with him a positive order to postpone the elections indefinitely, and thus plunging France into the fierce prolongation of a blind struggle. Lord Lyons, on being informed of this, addressed some very just and vigorous remonstrances to M. de Chaudordy.

On the 12th of October, Lord Granville tells Lord Bloomfield he has learnt from Count Apponyi that the Provisional Government of France had appealed for "the active support of Austria, even supposing that Russia should maintain her present attitude." Count Beust's answer was in the sense of the language we have

already quoted from him. He again expressed the opinion that England and Russia might interfere, but he declined to do so himself. On the question of the recognition of the Provisional Government he held language closely corresponding to that of Lord Granville. In short, Lord Granville said that though there were some observations made by Count Beust in which he did not concur, yet "it was satisfactory to see that the policy of the two Governments was the same."

Lord Lyons, on the 13th of October, reports that the French Government adhere to their first programme. Nevertheless Lord Granville appears at this moment to have discerned a gleam of hope, for on the 16th, in a letter to Sir A. Buchanan, he said there was some reason to suppose the Provisional Government would agree to Metz and Strasburg being razed, and he wished to know whether Prince Gortchakoff thought it might be possible for England and Russia to come to some understanding on the reasonable terms of peace, and then make a joint appeal to both parties. This elicited some important statements on the part of the Russian Government. Prince Gortchakoff expressed a conviction even stronger than that of Lord Granville that it would at present be of no avail to interpose, and he added that Russia had already gone further than any other Power, "as the Emperor, in his private correspondence with the King of Prussia, had expressed a hope that no annexation of French territory would be required," and the King had answered that he must be guided by the opinion of his allies and of Germany.

On the 18th of October M. Tissot was instructed to inform Lord Granville that overtures were being made to Italy to give armed support to France, that there were reasons which might induce Italy to give it, and he hoped Lord Granville would abstain from preventing Italy acting on her own inspirations. At the same time M. de Chaudordy at Tours, and M. Tissot in London, were again urging England "to take at once a decided and active part in the present state of affairs in Europe, and to use their influence in a direct manner to bring the war to an end on terms which it would be possible for France to accept." M. de Chaudordy relied on that misconception to which we have already referred respecting the supposed "League of Neutrals," urging that by placing herself at its head England had incurred a serious responsibility. She had "prevented France finding active allies," and thus rendered it incumbent on her "to take an active part in uniting

the neutral Powers in a common effort to moderate the pretensions of Prussia." Such an appeal is a testimony to Lord Granville's wisdom in avoiding the more formal and exacting engagement which Count Beust had desired. Lord Lyons had no difficulty in showing that the simple promise to communicate ideas had no bearing on the present state of affairs, and at last, after reminding the Count that "Her Majesty's Government had declared that they could not contemplate going to war with Germany," he begged him "to say distinctly what, short of this, he would propose that England should do." The following is M. de Chaudordy's answer:—He said he must premise that whatever England did must be done of her own accord, and must not have any appearance of being prompted by France. After the rejection of M. Jules Favre's overtures, it was plain that France could not address Prussia again. What he would suggest was that Her Majesty's Government, acting quite apart from France, should invite the other neutral Powers to make a combined application to Prussia. England should, he thought, take the lead in bringing the neutral Powers to an understanding on the subject, or she might act alone. The object, in either case, would be to call upon Prussia to say how far she meant to go; in fact, to declare distinctly on what conditions she would make peace. Having ascertained this, England and the Powers acting in concert with her might, in the same way, make themselves acquainted with the views and feelings of France. This being done, the neutral Powers should hold a Conference (or, if this were objected to, communicate their ideas to each other in some other manner), and then pronounce, distinctly and authoritatively, what were, in their opinion, equitable terms of peace, and call upon both belligerents to accept the terms so laid down. Both France and Prussia must be disposed to listen with respect to the voice of united Europe, and each might find it easier to make concessions in deference to the recommendations of an European Conference than to yield to each other. Such was the plan M. de Chaudordy would suggest: and if England was indisposed to take the lead in executing it, she might advise Italy or some other power to do so. Only, he repeated, whatever was done, must be done altogether independently of France and the French Government; "*en dehors de nous*," was the expression he used. Having made this suggestion, M. de Chaudordy reverted to the dangers to Europe, and to England in particular, which must

follow if means were not taken while it was yet time to prevent the establishment of Prussian supremacy.

But though Her Majesty's Government could not yield to these passionate appeals, they took advantage of Count Bismarck's Circular respecting the dangers of famine which threatened Paris, to make a formal suggestion to Prussia and France that they should agree upon an Armistice for the convocation of a Constituent Assembly. Having once suggested this proposal, Lord Granville seems to have pressed it with great energy. He promptly informed Count Bernstorff of M. Thiers' proposal to undertake the negotiation, and M. Thiers was assisted in his application by the personal intervention of the Emperor of Russia.

Russia, Austria, Italy, and Spain joined in urging the Armistice on both Governments, and Italy appeared to desire even more decided intervention. There is, however, a despatch we reluctantly omit from Sir A. Paget, detailing an account furnished to him by M. Visconti Venosta of a conversation with M. Senard, the French Representative at Florence, in the course of which M. Venosta gave most forcible expression to his views of the course which political prudence recommended to France at this juncture. If the rulers of France had been Italian politicians, they would probably before this have discovered some solution of their difficulties. The manner in which Count Bernstorff at first replied to Lord Granville's note of the 25th was not encouraging. The French, on their side, appeared still dissatisfied, for M. Tissot called on Lord Granville to urge again that the neutral Powers should call on Prussia to state her terms of peace, "bring them within fair limits, and then communicate them to the French Government." All the principal negotiators, however, adhered to the prudent course of confining the proposed negotiations solely to the question of an Armistice. We ought, perhaps, to mention that the Russian Government addressed its official support of Lord Granville's proposals to France alone, the Czar reserving all representations to Prussia for his private correspondence with the King.

We need not repeat from the Correspondence the history of M. Thiers' mission and its failure on the question of revictualment. Soon afterwards, however, Count Bernstorff said a renewed "direct communication" would be welcomed at Versailles, and this would be much the better course if the Provisional Government were in earnest. Lord Granville said it appeared strange on the

part of a great country like Germany to be so sensitive as to the friendly action of any other power; and that "the dead lock appeared to be created by the Germans declining to make advances, while the French were at least equally indisposed to take first steps." Lord Granville telegraphed at once to Lord Lyons Count Bernstorff's statement of the willingness of the Prussian Chancellor to resume the negotiation, and Lord Lyons reported from a conversation with M. Thiers and others that the French Government would gladly resume the negotiation on condition of revictualment. M. Tissot made representations in a similar sense to Lord Granville. The following day M. Tissot made a renewed suggestion:—"He thought the presence of Mr. Odo Russell at Versailles might afford the Cabinet of London facilities for negotiations." Lord Granville simply referred, in reply, to the language we have just quoted from him and to the fact that he "had been positively informed by Count Bernstorff that a direct communication from the French Government would be more likely to succeed." But though M. Favie wrote on the 19th that the Government of the National Defence "were more than ever anxious to be delivered from the horrible burden which had been on their shoulders since the 4th of September last," they still refused to make any overtures on their own account, they maintained the impossibility of holding elections without an Armistice, and they persisted in their request that Mr. Odo Russell might sound M. Bismarck. Lord Granville could not yield to this request, but nothing could discourage the pertinacity of the French appeals for help, and despatch after despatch describes interviews with M. de Chaudordy and M. Tissot. Lord Granville communicated one threefold alternative to Count Bismarck, at M. de Chaudordy's suggestion, and on the 19th of December he sends to Lord Lyons the following uncompromising reply:—

Foreign Office, Dec. 19th, 1870.

My Lord,—Count Bismarck, who has been made acquainted with the terms of your Excellency's telegram of the 16th inst., has replied that it is quite impossible to accede to any one of the three demands of the French Government as therein stated—namely, either an Armistice with the condition of revictualing, in order to elect a Constituent Assembly; or the conclusion of peace without any cession of territory; or the assembly of a European Congress which should discuss the questions at issue between France and

Prussia; and his Excellency added, moreover, that any German Government which should accede to such proposals, without being obliged to yield to force of arms, would find itself in the position of being compelled to abdicate.

I am, &c.
(Signed) GRANVILLE.

We now approach the end, and Lord Granville begins to use language of partial remonstrance to Prussia. Count Bernstorff gave him an opening early in January, of which he availed himself as follows:—

"If Germany was unable to conclude the war at once, obtaining her own terms of peace, she would regret the persistent way in which she had shown her objection to make use or to allow of the friendly offices of the neutral Powers. I quite understood that being successful in a great war of which she had to bear all the brunt and all the sacrifices, she had determined not to be dictated to by those who had stood aloof. It was probably the same feeling which had prevented the Imperial Government from consenting to any mediation. The Republican Government had made different appeals to us, to which we had invariably answered that we could not interfere unless our mediation or advice would be acceptable to both parties or would be likely to be effective. If the war was continued, if France became totally disorganized, a curse to herself and to Europe, incapable of indemnifying Germany for the costs of the war, and Germany had no resource but to seize and occupy vast territories filled with unwilling inhabitants, blame would attach to her for having rejected, not the intervention, but the good offices of some of the neutral Powers, of a character which had so often led to satisfactory results in international disputes."

Then followed a despatch in which Count Bismarck enumerated the misdeeds of the French in the war. In reference to this despatch, Lord Granville wrote to Lord Loftus, at Berlin, on the 20th of January, urging that Germany, in the full tide of her victories, could not fear any misconstruction of her motives in endeavouring to bring to an end the miseries of the war, and suggesting the advantage of a declaration by the Imperial Government of its views, and of its readiness to negotiate.

The series closes with the documents relating to the Armistice, and a final despatch from Lord Granville, announcing the decision of the Cabinet on the question of recognizing the Provisional Government.

III.

CORRESPONDENCE RESPECTING THE SINKING OF
SIX BRITISH VESSELS IN THE RIVER SEINE BY
PRUSSIAN TROOPS.

No. 1.

CONSUL BERNAL TO EARL GRANVILLE.
(Received December 27.)*Havre, December 26, 1870.*

MY LORD,—I have the honour to enclose herewith copy of an official letter from Acting Vice-Consul Herring to Vice-Consul Lee-Jortin, which has been forwarded on to me by that gentleman, narrating the seizure by the Germans of six English merchant-vessels (colliers), and their subsequent sinking by them in the River Seine at or near Duclair.

Mr. Windsor, an English gentleman living at Rouen, who brought Mr. Herring's letter to Dieppe, and hence here, crosses to England to-morrow. He will bring this despatch to the Foreign Office, and be ready, should your Lordship wish, to give further information on the subject. He informs me that there are three more English colliers at Rouen.

I also learn from him that the British residents are about 250 in number in and about that town.

I have, &c.

(Signed) FREDERICK BERNAL.

No. 2.

ACTING VICE-CONSUL HERRING TO
VICE-CONSUL JORTIN.*Rouen, December 23, 1870.*

SIR,—I have to inform you of very grave events occurring at this port. On the 21st and 22nd instant Prussian troops took forcible possession of and scuttled six British vessels in the River Seine, near to Duclair (port of Rouen), where they were lying taking in ballast for England.

Notwithstanding the several captains' energetic protests against this proceeding and violation of the British flag, the crews were forced ashore and had to sleep in the open air during a severe frosty night. Time was hardly given the men to save their effects, which many of them have lost, together with money, &c. Permission had been previously given to the vessels by the Prussian authorities to come up to Rouen and discharge their cargoes of coals, which they had done, and were on their return when seized,

Prussian officer who seized said vessels saying he took them as a military requisition, giving the several captains an acknowledgment for their value written in German: these papers I have now in my possession. There are three other vessels at this moment discharging coals at the quay here, which are threatened with a like seizure and sinking.

I have protested formally to the General commanding the forces occupying Rouen against this arbitrary proceeding and violation of a neutral flag.

Not being able to communicate with our Consul at Havre, I address myself to you, sir, requesting you will communicate this serious affair to the British Government immediately. The several crews, amounting to thirty-four men, I send on to you at Dieppe, begging you will please forward them on to their homes. The captains remain for the present at Rouen. I may add that some of the vessels were fired upon by Prussian soldiers, the crew narrowly escaping from being struck.

I am, &c.

(Signed) H. D. HERRING.

No. 3.

EARL GRANVILLE TO LORD A. LOFTUS.

Foreign Office, December 28, 1870.

MY LORD,—I transmit to your Excellency herewith without delay a copy of a despatch and its enclosure from Her Majesty's Consul at Havre, and of a report made to the Board of Admiralty by the Commander of Her Majesty's ship "Heli-con" at that port, respecting six British vessels having been sunk in the Seine near Duclair, by order of the commander of the Prussian troops occupying Rouen; and I have to instruct you to lose no time in calling the attention of the Prussian Government to this matter. With the information now before them, Her Majesty's Government cannot but consider the seizure and sinking of those vessels to be altogether unwarrantable, and the firing upon them, if it took place, a matter which requires the fullest explanations.

You will express the hope that immediate inquiry will be made into the

transaction, and the conviction that if no satisfactory explanation of the proceeding is given by the Prussian General, the Prussian Government will at once take such steps as the case, as it now stands, appears to call for.

I am, &c.
(Signed) GRANVILLE.

No. 7.

LORD A. LOFTUS TO EARL GRANVILLE.

(Received January 2, 1871.)

Berlin, December 31, 1870.

My Lord,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt by yesterday's messenger of your lordship's despatch of the 28th instant, with its several enclosures, referring to the arbitrary proceedings of the Prussian military authorities at Rouen by the seizure and sinking of six British merchant-vessels at the port of Duclair.

I lost no time in bringing this matter under the notice of Baron Thile, and, in conformity with your lordship's instructions, I addressed a note to his Excellency, of which I have the honour to annex a copy.

Baron Thile stated to me yesterday that no report had reached him as yet on this matter, and that he was therefore unable to express any opinion upon it, but that he would immediately forward my note to Count Bismarck.

I have the honour to enclose to your lordship herewith copy of a letter I have this day received from Baron Thile, acknowledging the receipt of my note of yesterday's date, and stating that it would be forwarded to Count Bismarck by this evening's courier.

I have, &c.
(Signed) AUGUSTUS LOFTUS.

No. 8.

EARL GRANVILLE TO MR. ODO RUSSELL.

(Extract.)

Foreign Office, January 7, 1871.

Her Majesty's Government learned with much satisfaction from your telegram of the 1st instant that Count Bismarck had expressed his regret at the sinking of the British vessels, and that he was prepared, after a proper inquiry had been instituted, to pay compensation for the damage sustained thereby; and I lost no time in instructing you by telegraph to thank him for his courteous and satisfactory communication. I should, however, wish you to lose no opportunity of pressing an early settlement of the matter, as considerable injustice would be done to the sufferers if

the payment of the compensation, to which they are undoubtedly entitled, should be unduly delayed.

No. 9.

COUNT BISMARCK TO COUNT BERNSTORFF.
(Communicated to Earl Granville
by Count Bernstorff, January 9.)

Versailles, January 8, 1871.

The report of the Commander of that part of our army by which the English collier-ships were sunk in the Seine has not yet arrived, but as far as our intelligence goes, the general outline of the facts is known.

You are authorized in consequence, to say to Lord Granville that we sincerely regret that our troops, in order to avert immediate danger, were obliged to seize ships which belonged to British subjects. We admit their claim to indemnification, and shall pay to the owners the value of the ships, according to equitable estimation, without keeping them waiting for the decision of the question who is finally to indemnify them. Should it be proved that excesses have been committed which were not justified by the necessity of defence, we should regret it still more, and call the guilty persons to account.

The official answer to Lord Augustus Loftus' note will follow after the Report from the army has been received.

No. 10.

EARL GRANVILLE TO LORD A. LOFTUS.

Foreign Office, January 18, 1871.

My Lord,—I enclose herewith to your Excellency copy of a telegram from Versailles which has been communicated to me by Count Bernstorff, in which it is promised that the owners of the British vessels sunk at Rouen shall be at once indemnified. It is added that an official answer will be sent to your Excellency's representations after the Report from the army shall have been received.

I have to instruct your Excellency to take an early opportunity of expressing to M. de Thile the great satisfaction with which Her Majesty's Government have learnt that the Government of the North German Confederation have so readily adopted a course which from its promptitude and friendly character promises, if carried out in the same spirit, to turn a painful incident into a means of confirming the good understanding which exists between the two Governments.

I am, &c.
(Signed) GRANVILLE.

No. 11.

MR. ODO RUSSELL TO EARL GRANVILLE.

(Received January 13.)

Versailles, January 3, 1871.

My Lord,—I sent your lordship a telegram on the 1st instant in answer to your lordship's telegram of the 31st ultimo, respecting the six English colliers fired into and sunk by the Prussian authorities at Duclair, near Rouen, to say that Count Bismarck greatly regretted this disaster, and that his Excellency had ordered an immediate inquiry into the transaction, and was ready to pay compensation if called for by the circumstances of the case.

Since then I have received and communicated to Count Bismarck your lordship's despatch to Lord Augustus Loftus, but his Excellency had already received an official note from Her Majesty's Ambassador at Berlin, which he said he would answer officially as soon as the result of the inquiry had been received and submitted to the law officers.

I have also conveyed your lordship's thanks to Count Bismarck for his courteous and satisfactory reply of the 1st instant.

I have, &c.

(Signed) ODO RUSSELL.

No. 12.

MR. ODO RUSSELL TO EARL GRANVILLE.

(Received January 13.)

Versailles, January 8, 1871.

My Lord,—After receiving this morning your lordship's telegram of yesterday afternoon, I called on Count Bismarck and again talked over the question of the six English colliers shot at and sunk by the Prussian authorities at Duclair.

His Excellency said that he had not yet received a circumstantial account of the transaction, but he found that the law officers held that a belligerent had a full right, in self-defence, to the seizure of neutral vessels in the rivers or inland waters of the other belligerent, and that compensation to the owners was due by the vanquished Power, not by the victors.

If conquering belligerents admitted the right of foreigners and neutrals to compensation for the destruction of their property in the invaded State, they would open the door to new and inadmissible principles in warfare. Claims for indemnity were submitted to him daily by neutrals holding property in France which he could never admit. He valued, however, the friendship and good-will of England too highly to accept this inter-

pretation of the law in the present case and preferred to adopt one that would meet the wishes of Her Majesty's Government and give full satisfaction to the people of England.

He deplored the treatment to which the masters and crews of the colliers had been subjected, according to the accounts he had read in the newspapers, and begged I would assure your lordship, with expressions of deep regret, that when the reports from the Prussian authorities had been received he would obtain the King's permission to pay any just compensation to the owners and sufferers your lordship might think right to recommend.

I have, &c.

(Signed) ODO RUSSELL.

No. 14.

COUNT BISMARCK TO COUNT BERNSTORFF.

(Communicated to Earl Granville by Count Bernstorff, February 1.)

Versailles, January 25, 1871.

(Translation.)

I do myself the honour of transmitting to your Excellency, in pursuance of my preliminary communication of the 4th, and my telegram of the 8th instant, a copy of the Report from the 1st Army, on the sinking of English ships in the Seine, near Duclair, the preparation of which has been delayed by the manifold movements of the Corps concerned. Your Excellency will find therein, with the same satisfaction as myself, that the measure in question, however exceptional its nature, did not overstep the bounds of international warlike usages. The Report shows that a pressing danger was at hand, and every other means of averting it was wanting; the case was therefore one of necessity, which, even in time of peace, may render the employment or destruction of foreign property admissible, under reservation of indemnification. I take the opportunity of calling to mind that a similar right in time of war has become a peculiar institute of law, the *jus angarie*, which so high an authority as Sir Robert Phillimore defines thus: that a belligerent Power demands and makes use of foreign ships, even such as are not in inland waters, but in ports and roadsteads within its jurisdiction, and even compels the crews to transport troops, ammunition, or implements of warfare. I hope the negotiation with the owners, for which you are already authorized, will lead to an understanding as to the indemnification for the damage; if not, it would have to be submitted to an arbitrator's award. In the negotiation, also, the difference in

the statements of the 1st Army and of the English Consul at Dieppe, as to the number of English ships sunk, will be explained.

I respectfully request your Excellency to communicate this despatch, with its enclosure, to the Secretary of State of Her Britannic Majesty, and to be so good as to express, at the same time, my apology for the delay, as well as my thanks to Her Majesty's Government for the just appreciation of the military necessity with which Lord Granville has apprehended and treated this matter.

(Signed) BISMARCK.

(Inclosure in No. 14.)

Report of the 1st Army Corps on the Sinking of Ships off Duclair.

(Translation.)

The 1st Army Corps having received orders to occupy Rouen with three infantry brigades (one was left at Amiens), and to secure itself by proper positions in advance on both banks of the Seine against an enemy who was known to be numerically stronger than the Army Corps, the attention of the General in command was the more necessarily directed first of all to the Seine itself, as information had been received that French men-of-war had but a short time before left the port of Rouen.

A close examination of the Seine was therefore ordered; and soundings taken by engineer officers showed that the channel was from 30 to 35 feet deep throughout, and the depth was increased from 4 to 10 feet by the tide.

Several French men-of-war also soon appeared, and steamed with the rising tide as far as off Duclair; they returned with the ebb to Candebeac, where most of them remained for the night. Our patrols, where they showed themselves, were hotly fired upon by the men-of-war: hostile detachments were even disembarked on the left bank of the Seine. It is clear that the troops were thereby really endangered in their positions and operations.

It was not only possible for the enemy to flank an advance of our troops on the right or left bank by a direct artillery fire, but a change from one bank to the other was extraordinarily facilitated for the hostile troops—nay, they might even be disembarked in the rear of ours.

According to the statement of competent judges, a large wooden ship, which was stationed in the Seine with two or three small ships, alone held 1000 troops for landing.

Another considerable evil was, that the men-of-war entirely stopped the road to Candebeac, as it runs close to the bank at the foot of the steep rocky cliffs.

Finally, the appearance of the men-of-war kept the inhabitants of Rouen in continual excitement, which was the more to be avoided as the quartering of troops, the closing of the manufactories, &c., already made the temper of the workmen worse from day to day.

Under these circumstances, General von Benthien ordered Lieutenant-Colonel von der Burg, Chief of the General Staff, to have the Seine completely blocked up. Fresh examinations and conferences with the first engineer officer, Major Fahland, gave the following result:—

It is impossible to block up the channel completely by means of the low river ships; this can only be effected by sinking high-built sea ships. The great expense of attaining the end in this manner makes it appear desirable to attempt the blocking up in another and less costly manner, for example:—

1. By the formation of batteries which were made near La Fontaine.
2. By torpedoes.

The first measure proved insufficient, as it was soon ascertained that some of the small steamers were armour-plated, and the commander had only field artillery at his disposal, the second failed from the want of the requisite materials at the time.

Therefore the only possible means of blocking up the channel was by the sinking of sea ships. So Lieutenant-Colonel von der Burg ordered Major Fahland to seize all the sea ships which were off Duclair. This measure was necessary, because if a requisition had been made for ships to the mayoralty here, probably all the ships, timely warned, would have gone to Havre.

All the ships seized immediately hoisted neutral flags, especially English. In the urgency of the matter researches could not then be made how far the neutral flag covers ships also in rivers, and lying especially between belligerent parties. The suitable ships were pointed out for sinking.

The work began on the 19th December; altogether eleven ships were sunk, amongst them seven English ones.

It is hardly worth mentioning that the reports of some French newspapers, stating that the British crews were brutally treated, are quite unfounded. As only three ships were sunk daily there was time enough to warn the crews to save their papers and effects, which was done. Besides, an order was handed to the captains in which the value of the ship, according to the captain's own statement, was entered.

Finally, it must also be mentioned that, in order to spare the ships as much as possible, the ballast-ports only were a little enlarged. Therefore, if they have not been tossed about and damaged by the ebb and flow in the bed of the Seine,

it appears not unlikely that after they are raised they may again be fit for use.

For the General in Command,
(Signed) VON BENTHEIM,
*Lieutenant-General and Com-
mander of Division.*

IV.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN BRITISH SUBJECTS
RESIDING IN FRANCE AND THE FOREIGN OFFICE,
IN REFERENCE TO LOSS OF PROPERTY SINCE
THE ENTRY OF THE GERMAN ARMY INTO
FRANCE.

No. 1.

EARL GRANVILLE TO LORD LYONS.

Foreign Office, September 2, 1870.

MY LORD,—Having received from different parties applications for the protection of their property and for exemption from military requisitions, I thought it best to consult the law officers of the Crown on the subject; and as your Excellency will doubtless have received many similar applications, I think it may be convenient for you to be made acquainted, for your guidance, with the nature of the answer which, under their advice, I return to such applications: namely, that “British subjects having property in France are not entitled to any special protection for their property, or to exemption from military contributions to which they will be liable in common with the inhabitants of the place in which they reside, or in which their property may be situated.”

I am, &c.
(Signed) GRANVILLE.

No. 2.

LORD LYONS TO EARL GRANVILLE.

(Received January 10.)

Bordeaux, January 6, 1871.

MY LORD,—I have the honour to transmit to your lordship a copy of a letter which I have received to-day from Mr. Robert William Kirby, who appears to be a British subject established at La Ferté Imbault, in the department of the Loire-et-Cher, and who complains of the treatment suffered by him and his family at the hands of German troops, and demands redress. I enclose also a certificate from the Maire of the Commune which accompanied the letter.

Lastly, I enclose herewith a copy of the answer which I have made to Mr. Kirby, and in which I have informed him that I have forwarded a copy of his letter to your lordship.

I have, &c.
(Signed) LYONS.

(Inclosure 1 in No. 2.)

MR. KIRBY TO LORD LYONS.

*Chateau de la Ferté Imbault, près
Salbris, Loire-et-Cher.*

December 28, 1870.

MY LORD,—I have the honour to lay before your lordship a statement of the pillage, menaces, and ill-treatment which we, a family of British subjects, have suffered at the hands of the Prussian troops, and to beg for the redress your lordship may think proper to obtain for us. We have been settled in this commune of La Ferté Imbault for many years, my uncle having bought this property and left it to us. My father is a clergyman of the Church of England, we have all been educated in England, we are purely English, and I enclose a certificate of our British citizenship.

On the evening of the 7th instant, on hearing of the entry of the Prussians into Salbris, two leagues off, we hoisted the British flag over the gate of our chateau, trusting that respect for a neutral flag would protect our persons and property; in this expectation we were entirely disappointed. On the morning of the 8th instant, Colonel von Rosenberg, commanding the whole or part of the Yellow Lancers or Uhlans, I think the 5th Regiment, came up and peremptorily demanded, through one of his officers, lodging for the night, although we announced our nationality, and directed his attention to the British

flag. They then rode away, and were succeeded by a few Hussars, commanded by a young officer, who rode into our courtyard, and finding my father there, an old man and a clergyman, at once put a pistol to his breast, and ordered him to have all our horses brought up instantly that he might choose the best; fortunately, however, he rejected them all as not being good enough, and contented himself with ordering us to bring him three bottles of our best wine, with which he finally withdrew:—all this though we earnestly called his attention to our flag and nationality.

In the evening Colonel Von Rosenberg returned with his troops, and his first proceeding, after turning us nearly all, ladies included, out of our rooms, which he and his officers at once occupied, was to order me, after I should have their dinner ready, to have soup prepared for twenty men also. As I was unable to have this done, the provisions I had in the castle not being enough, Colonel Von Rosenberg threatened to put my father and me under arrest, but as I defied him to do so, he did not proceed beyond threats. During the officers' dinner, though I had them served with ordinary and good Bordeaux wine, they called me in and demanded six bottles of champagne. As there were only women servants in the house, of course frightened and excited by this invasion, my brother and I were obliged to go and fetch them this ourselves—similarly with tea, and afterwards with blankets, feather beds, fires in each room, &c., for these gentlemen were contented with nothing short of luxury in their newly-appropriated quarters, and seemed to take a pleasure in giving us the utmost trouble they could. Finally, they ordered breakfast for early morning and went to bed.

In the meantime their men had broken open the doors of our granaries, and had taken all the oats stored for our horses for the winter, and a great portion of our hay, stabling some of their horses in the hay-shed, so as to waste as much as they took. On my remonstrating with the Colonel, he had said this was quite right, and that the fault was mine in not having opened the doors, which, by the way, I would have done if I could have been in several places at once on their arrival, for from the first I offered no opposition to their demands as long as I could satisfy them. Next morning they rode away, after making us serve them at breakfast as before, though their orderlies were in the house; and I had to run after the Colonel to get a receipt for the hay and oats they had taken, simply as a precaution, to be able to show to those that

might come after that we had been already plundered. Even then I found it difficult to get his staff officer to put down the right quantity.

That morning and several afterwards many little sundries were missed from the rooms which the officers, fourteen in number, had occupied during the night. Colonel Von Rosenberg and another, either an officer or an orderly, had slept in a room usually occupied by an English friend staying with us, Mr. David Cannon. In the morning Mr. Cannon missed the following articles: a drinking flask, a pair of plated spurs (convenient on the march, as they require little cleaning), one, if not two, flannel shirts, and a piece of soap. My brother's worked slippers and handkerchief were also stolen, as were some down quilts and pillow slips, &c. Let me say, *en passant*, that it is amusing to see English papers, in speculating on the chances of the war, lay stress on the fact that the Germans came into France insufficiently clad—a small consideration with troops who, like Falstaff's, find linen enough (and woollen too) on every hedge, or rather in every body's drawers. At Salbris, Nonan, Sheillay, and the other stations on the Ligne du Centre, in this neighbourhood, they have ransacked all the houses, and taken every thing they wish for their comfort and luxury. In our stables, the soldiers had turned out our horses, broken down the stalls, stolen five or six saddles, halters, whips, spurs, horse-rug and roller, &c.

Next day, the 9th instant, came twelve cuirassiers of, I think, the 9th Regiment, commanded by Lieutenant Von Spalding. The soldiers rode into our courtyard, and demanded oats and cognac, while the officer went and sat in the alberge of the village. In vain I showed the receipt for all the oats I had had taken from me the day before. The soldier or non-commissioned officer in command (named Fluch, as the officers afterwards told us) proceeded to menaces to make me produce oats that I had not. Finding menaces useless, he struck me two violent blows on the side of the head with the flat of his drawn sword; finding that useless, he made a lunge to run me through the body, which I avoided, and escaped through the stables, fortunately open, while the cuirassier turned his fury upon my father and Mr. Cannon, who were present. Meantime I went down to the village to complain to the officer in command, who certainly did reprimand the soldier, but who did not refrain from robbing one of our farms of poultry half an hour afterwards, with the same man, though he had given me his word of honour, before wit-

nesses, that the soldier should be punished. I have omitted to state that the same man had previously struck my brother, ordering him to bring wine, and calling him a swine. My brother had returned the compliment, but not brought him the wine.

One Prussian officer had been heard to remark of us in the village, "They think that their filthy rag of an English colour" (which he called by an obscene name) "will protect them, but they will find themselves very much mistaken;" and all the rest of them seem to have acted with the same feeling, except, let me state it to his honour, one staff officer, the Baron von Treskow, who also did good service in protecting the property in the village.

On Saturday, the 10th, two parties of Uhlans arrived and searched for oats in our granaries, though assured by us that there were none left; and again our horses were inspected, but not considered good enough to rob us of. The Uhlans generally, throughout, spoke to us lance and pistol in hand.

About the 13th they retreated from this neighbourhood, and we have seen no more of them here, though they have been pillaging as far as Salleris, and there is continual danger of their return.

I trust your lordship will excuse the length of this statement. I have considered that the minutest details had a certain importance, as regarding British persons and property. M. le Préfet de Loire-et-Cher has kindly undertaken to forward you our complaint, which I would have despatched sooner had I known that communication was possible.

Though we are any thing but rich, we think less of the pecuniary loss we have sustained than of the insults offered to ourselves and our nationality; at the same time, I may as well state that from the above occurrences we do not lose less than 4000 francs, the deterioration of our stock from the loss of our hay and oats in a year of such scarcity being considered. We leave the whole question of reparation, without reserve, in your lordship's hands, feeling confident that you will exact whatever is possible and adequate.

I beg that your lordship will, if you should think fit, do me the honour to have this published in the principal English journals.

(Signed) ROBERT WILLIAM KIRBY.

Vu par nous, Maire de la Ferté Imbault, Canton de Salbris, pour légalisation de la signature de Mr. Robert William Kirby apposée ci-dessus.

La Ferté Imbault, le 29 Décembre, 1870.

(Signé) LOUIS DESCHAMPS.

(Inclosure 2 in No. 2.)

(Translation.)

The Undersigned, L. E. J. Deschamps, Mayor of La Ferté Imbault, Canton of Salbris (Loire et Cher), France, certifies and attests that Mr. Robert William Kirby, son, born in this Commune, is an English citizen, and has never been naturalized a Frenchman, any more than his father, or any member of his family.

I further declare, on the honour of my soul and conscience, that I have known Mr. Kirby well enough, and for a long time, to know that he is incapable of attesting a false fact, and that he has always been in this Commune a model to all the inhabitants of delicacy, sentiments of honour, humanity, and probity.

In faith of which I have delivered these presents, which I certify to be exact before God and man.

The Mayor,

(Signed) LOUIS DESCHAMPS.

No. 3.

EARL GRANVILLE TO LORD LYONS.

Foreign Office, January 11, 1871.

My Lord,—I have received your Excellency's despatch of the 6th instant, enclosing a letter from Mr. Kirby, an English gentleman established with his family at La Ferté Imbault, complaining of the conduct of the German troops in making requisitions on his property; and I have to instruct you to acquaint that gentleman that, much as Her Majesty's Government regret the inconvenience and loss to which he and his family were exposed, it is out of their power to interfere to obtain any redress for him, inasmuch as foreigners residing in a country which is the seat of war are equally liable with the natives of this country to have requisitions levied on their property by the belligerents.

I am, &c.

(Signed) GRANVILLE.

No. 4.

MR. CONSUL BERNAL TO EARL GRANVILLE.

(Received January 24.)

My Lord,—I have the honour to enclose herewith copy of a statement made by Mr. Lawrence Smith, master of the English barque "Theresa," respecting the alleged wilful destruction by the German troops of a house and furniture belonging to him at St. Ouen, about fourteen miles below Rouen.

Mr. Smith was absent from home at the

time the occurrences are alleged to have taken place.

I have, &c.
(Signed) FREDERIC BERNAL.

(Inclosure in No. 4)

Protest of Mr. Lawrence Smith, Master of the English Barque "Theresa," against the wanton destruction by fire of his house and property at St. Ouen, a town about fourteen miles from Rouen, on the Honfleur side of the Seine.

On December 15, 1870, about 500 Prussian soldiers arrived at St. Ouen, a village about a mile from La Bouville. Though the English flag was flying, thirty-one soldiers were quartered on me for the night, whom I had to feed at my own expense. On December 17 sixty Prussian soldiers came to my house and robbed me of all my provisions, corn, straw, and farm stock. They left on the 18th. The same evening a party of four were quartered on us for the night. On December 31 sixty Prussian soldiers were again quartered at my house until the following day. On January 4, 1871, about seven o'clock in the morning, about sixty Prussian soldiers surrounded my house. My family had previously retired to the cellars. Five minutes afterwards the Prussians fired a volley of musketry into the cellar, and my family only escaped death by being in a smaller cellar at right angles to the entrance. Mrs. Smith, as soon as the firing ceased, rushed out with a child in her arms, and the remaining portion of the family followed. The troops then broke all the windows, destroyed the furniture; and, making a pile of the *debris*, they set fire to it and the house. They refused to allow linen or anything to be taken away, even burning all our wearing apparel. They took away all the things they could carry. The English flag, which was hoisted, was first ordered to be taken down. Every thing in the cellar was also burnt; two of my children were frost-bitten badly through the family having been driven away half-dressed, with bare feet, into the nearest wood, where they had, without sufficient clothing, to remain three hours in the snow. I estimate my loss at 2000*l.* sterling.

(Signed) LAWRENCE SMITH.

No. 5.

VISCOUNT ENFIELD TO CONSUL BERNAL.
Foreign Office, Jan. 31, 1871.

Sir,—I am directed by Earl Granville to acknowledge the receipt of your despatch of the 23rd instant, enclosing a

statement made by Lawrence Smith, a British subject, respecting the alleged wilful destruction of a house and furniture belonging to him by the German troops at St. Ouen, about fourteen miles from Rouen, and, in reply, to convey to you his lordship's wishes that you should, if possible, personally inquire into the truth of the alleged facts, and report to him the result of your investigations.

I am, &c.
(Signed) ENFIELD.

No. 6.

CONSUL BERNAL TO EARL GRANVILLE.
(Received Feb. 6.)

Havre, Feb. 3, 1871.

My Lord,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of Lord Enfield's despatch of the 31st ultimo, conveying to me your lordship's wishes that I should, if possible, personally inquire into the truth of the facts alleged by Captain Smith respecting the destruction of his property at St. Ouen by the German forces. There would be no means of my personally inquiring into the truth of his statement without visiting the locality, but I had a conversation with him on the subject, and the impression left on my mind was that he was telling a true story. He gave the same account of the circumstances to Mr. Vice-Consul Wagner at Honfleur, and to Commander Crozier, of Her Majesty's ship "Helicon," who likewise, I believe, saw Mrs. Smith and her children. Captain Smith sailed with his vessel, the "Theresa," for the Tyne two days ago. His address is, "Care of Messrs. Bell and Dunn, of Queen-street, Newcastle-on-Tyne."

I have, &c.
(Signed) FREDERIC BERNAL.

No. 7.

MESSRS. BELL AND DUNN TO EARL GRANVILLE.
(Received Feb. 9.)

*8, Queen-street, Newcastle-on-Tyne,
Feb. 8, 1871.*

Honoured Sir,—We respectfully beg to ask your lordship, on behalf of Captain L. Smith of the English ship "Theresa," who had his house burned and furniture destroyed in France on the 4th January last, and his wife and family most cruelly ill-treated, without the slightest provocation, by the Prussian soldiers (the particulars of which outrage would be forwarded to your lordship by Her Majesty's Consul at Havre), if your lordship has received any reply from the Prussian Government on this matter, and if they have agreed

to pay him the compensation which he claims.

Captain Smith arrived in the Tyne with his ship on Saturday last, with his family on board, and as he will require to leave again shortly, he will at once have to make arrangements to leave his family here, and as they have lost every thing they possessed, even to their very clothes, the Prussians refusing to allow them to take sufficient to cover the children, driving them into the woods almost naked, of which fact your lordship will have been already informed. He is very anxious to know if any reply has yet been received, and for your lordship's information begs to state that Captain Smith, having had to go through the country from Havre to near La Douille to get to his family, he did not, although making inquiries, hear of a single similar case to his own, where they had acted with such wanton cruelty, and in the face of such facts is compelled to think that it was owing to the fact that they were English subjects that they were treated thus barbarously.

We have received from all classes, and from all parts, expressions of the greatest sympathy, all trusting the Prussians will at least be made to pay Captain Smith for the loss of property received, if no compensation for the injury done to his family; and soliciting the favour of your lordship's early reply, we are, &c.

(Signed) BELL AND DUNN, *Owners of ship "Theresa."*

No. 8.

MR. ODO RUSSELL TO EARL GRANVILLE.
(Received Feb. 13.)

Versailles, Feb. 9, 1871.

My Lord,—The enclosed petition from the English residents at Chantilly has been forwarded to me by Mr. Robert Coningsby, the able correspondent of the *Echo*, for presentation to the Emperor of Germany; but as I am not in a position to do so without your lordship's sanction, I send it home for your lordship's perusal and decision.

I have, &c.

(Signed) ODO RUSSELL.

(Inclosure in No. 8.)

Petition.

To His Imperial and Royal Majesty William I., Emperor of Germany, King of Prussia, at Versailles.

The humble Petition of the Undersigned British Subjects resident at Chantilly (Oise).

Most respectfully sheweth,—That your

petitioners, knowing Great Britain was a neutral Power, considered their property safe and themselves exempt from requisitions and billeting, that since the 15th September, 1870, we have had heavier requisitions, a greater number in proportion of your Majesty's soldiers billeted upon us, and more grievous impositions than the French have been subjected to; that unless your Most Gracious Majesty, by a timely exercise of your royal clemency, interpose on our behalf, complete ruin appears inevitable.

And your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

(Signed) THOMAS CARTER.

JOHN PALMER.

JOSEPH SPINK.

WILLIAM BALCHIN.

J. BARTHOLOMEW.

JOSEPH ASHMAN.

JOSEPH JACOBS.

ED. FLATMAN.

THOMAS HUDSON.

JOHN BAYNES.

WILLIAM PLANNER.

S. THOMAS.

M. EYRE.

JOHN CUNNINGTON.

JOHN BALDRICK.

HENRY KENDALL WOOD.

T. PAGE.

W. BOOTH.

MARY HODGES.

No. 9.

MR. WEST TO EARL GRANVILLE.
(Received Feb. 26.)

Paris, Feb. 24, 1871.

My Lord,—Repeated applications are now being made to Her Majesty's Embassy on the part of British subjects, whose property has been destroyed during the war, for indemnity for their losses. They wish to be informed of the decision of Her Majesty's Government respecting their supposed claims, and are most importunate in the matter.

Under these circumstances, I venture to apply to your lordship for instructions as to the answer which I am to return to them.

I have, &c.,

(Signed) L. S. SACKVILLE WEST.

No. 10.

EARL GRANVILLE TO MR. WEST.

Foreign Office, March 1, 1871.

Sir,—I have consulted the law officers of the Crown upon the point submitted to me in your despatch of the 24th February, as to the claims of British subjects

to be indemnified for the loss of property during the war; and I have now to acquaint you that I am advised by them that Her Majesty's subjects resident in France, whose property has been destroyed during the war, cannot expect to be compensated, on the ground of their being British subjects, for losses which the necessities of war have brought upon them in common with French subjects.

I am, &c.
(Signed) GRANVILLE.

No. 11.

EARL GRANVILLE TO MR. ODO RUSSELL.

Foreign Office, March 2, 1871.

Sir,—I return to you herewith the letter from Mr Coningsby, and the petition from the English residents at Chantilly, which you enclosed in your despatch of the 9th ultimo,

Her Majesty's Government are of opinion that you might request Count Bismarck to submit the petition to the gracious consideration of his Imperial Majesty the Emperor of Germany; but, in doing so, you should state that Her Majesty's Government make no claim for the petitioners to be exempted as British subjects from the evils incident to a state of war to which all other persons resident in France are exposed, but that they trust that, as an act of justice, it will not be permitted that heavier burdens should be imposed on the subjects of a neutral Power than are, in fact, imposed on the enemies of Germany.

I am, &c.
(Signed) GRANVILLE.

No. 12.

EARL GRANVILLE TO LORD A. LOFTUS.

Foreign Office, March 4, 1871.

My Lord,—I enclose to you herewith copies of correspondence¹ on the subject of the destruction, by Prussian troops, of a house and property at St. Ouen, near Rouen, belonging to a British subject named Lawrence Smith, under circumstances which would seem to call for investigation on the part of the Prussian military authorities.

Her Majesty's Government do not consider that, in strict right, they would be entitled to claim compensation from the Prussian Government for the destruction of Mr. Smith's property, as it would seem that, though an Englishman, he has become the proprietor of a house and farm at St. Ouen, and has established his wife

and family there, by which proceeding he has so incorporated himself into the territory of France as to render it unavoidable that his family and property should be exposed, like those of native citizens of France resident in the same district, to the evils incident to a state of war. But, as the case is at present represented, the destruction of the property in question would appear to have been an act of wanton violence on the part of the Prussian troops resulting from lax discipline, and not provoked by any misconduct on the part of the occupants of the house or farm. If this assumption be correct, the case would be distinguishable from those in which the destruction of property is an inevitable incident of war; and I am therefore of opinion that you may bring the facts to the notice of the German Government, and express the hope that they will think fit to direct an inquiry to be made by the military authorities, and if the statement of Mr. Lawrence Smith should prove to be truthful, that they will, as an act of justice, award compensation for injuries wantonly inflicted on him and upon his family.

I am, &c.
(Signed) GRANVILLE.

No. 13.

LORD LYONS TO EARL GRANVILLE.

(Received March 17.)

Paris, March 15, 1871.

My Lord,—I have the honour to enclose herewith copy of a letter which I have received from Mrs. Ashburnham, complaining of the destruction and pillage of her property at Versailles by the Germans.

I have informed Mrs. Ashburnham that the question whether the proprietor of her lodging can enforce the payment of the last six months' rent appears to be one which must be decided by the French law.

I have, &c.
(Signed) LYONS.

(Inclosure in No. 16.)

MRS. ASHBURNHAM TO LORD LYONS.

1, Rue Comte de l'Eguerre, Bruges, Belgique.

March 10, 1871.

My Lord,—With many apologies for intruding upon your valuable time, permit me to lay before you my very anxious position. Having suffered very seriously from the recent occupation of Versailles by the Prussians, I am informed that for

¹ Nos. 4, 5, 6, and 7.

any indemnity I must address myself to the ambassador of my own nation. I am the widow of an English clergyman, of very limited means, and have, with my sisters, occupied for the last seventeen years an apartment, 8, Avenue de Paris, Versailles. We had been absent some time before the occupation of that city by the Prussians, and, being ladies alone, it was impossible for us to return. And now, upon making inquiries, I find that during the six months that my apartment has been occupied, the larger portion of the furniture has been wantonly destroyed and burnt, and boxes of plate, wearing-apparel, household linen, &c., pillaged. In fact, at the lowest computation, we have been robbed of effects to the value of 300*l*. Will you kindly inform me whether, as the subject of a neutral Power, I have not a claim to some indemnity, and what steps I ought to take? Also, am I responsible for the maintenance of the Prussians during their occupation of my apartments? And, thirdly, can my proprietor enforce the payment of the last six months' rent, as I am only *Locataire*?

I beg to apologize for this intrusion, but the case is to me very serious, and I shall feel most grateful for a reply to this application, though I am aware that you must have many calls of a similar nature to attend to, but attention to this will be very gratefully received.

(Signed) HARRIET ASHBURNHAM.

No. 17.

EARL GRANVILLE TO LORD LYONS.

Foreign Office, March 18, 1871.

My Lord,—I have received your Excellency's despatch of the 15th instant, enclosing a copy of a letter from Mrs. Ashburnham, complaining of the destruction and pillage at Versailles by the Germans, and inquiring whether she has not some claim to indemnity, and also

whether she is responsible for the rent of her apartments during their occupation by the Prussians.

Your Excellency, it appears, has answered Mrs. Ashburnham's application on the last point; but as regards the general question of her being compensated for the other losses sustained by her, I can only request your Excellency to express to her the regret of Her Majesty's Government at the occurrences in question, and to explain to her that Her Majesty's subjects resident in France, whose property has been destroyed during the war, cannot expect to be compensated on the ground of their being British subjects, for losses which the necessities of war have brought upon them in common with French subjects.

I am, &c.

(Signed) GRANVILLE.

No. 18.

EARL GRANVILLE TO LORD LYONS.

Foreign Office, March 23, 1871.

My Lord,—I have thought it desirable to ascertain the opinion of the law officers as to the liability of the French Government to compensate British subjects resident in France for loss and damage to their property during the late war, and I have been advised by them that British subjects resident in France would, in their opinion, have no just ground of complaint against the French authorities in the event of their property having been destroyed by the invading armies. Their losses, under such circumstances, would be amongst the inevitable consequences of war raging in a State within which they have chosen, as foreigners, to take up their residence, and with regard to such losses, British subjects would not be entitled to claim any compensation from the French authorities.

I am, &c.

(Signed) GRANVILLE.

V.

CORRESPONDENCE RESPECTING THE PECUNIARY DEMANDS OF PRUSSIA ON FRANCE.

No. 1.

EARL GRANVILLE TO LORD A. LOFTUS¹.

Foreign Office, Feb. 24, 1871.

MY LORD,—Her Majesty's Government,

¹ Copies of this despatch were communicated on the 24th of February to Count Bernstorff and to Mr. Odo Russell.

without being informed of the other proposed terms of peace, understand from the Ambassador of France that the war indemnity demanded by Germany is six milliards of francs (240,000,000*l*.) to be paid almost immediately, and subject to some deductions not yet settled.

His Excellency has represented to the

Government of Her Majesty that it would be impossible for the Government of France to pay such a sum, and that it would be dishonest on their part to enter into an engagement for a payment which they know it would be absolutely beyond their power to fulfil, and they urge the Government of Her Majesty to represent to the German Government the impossibility of such a payment.

Her Majesty's Government feel the difficulties which arise from their ignorance of the offers made on the side of France, and they bear in mind that this country is one only among the neutral Powers, all bound by the obligations of friendship to both parties.

But Her Majesty's Government are willing, in consideration of the extreme pressure of time, to make representations to Germany on the amount of this indemnity, and to tender their good offices in the spirit of friendship to both parties, under the conviction that it is the interest of Germany, as well as of France, that the amount of the indemnity should not be greater than that which it is reasonable to expect could be paid.

I am, &c.
(Signed) GRANVILLE.

No. 2.

EARL GRANVILLE TO LORD LYONS.

Foreign Office, February 25, 1871.

My Lord,—I transmit to your Excellency herewith a copy of a letter from M. Jules Favre, with reference to the Duc de Broglie's appointment as Ambassador for France at this Court, and which was placed in my hands by his Excellency.

I expressed to the French Ambassador my thanks for the friendly tenor of this communication, but I observed there was one phrase in it, namely, that which, whilst referring to the friendly relations which have so long existed between England and France, implied some disappointment that in the hour of her present trial England had withheld her support, which I could not on our side admit. That I perfectly understood that France should have felt some irritation, whether reasonable or not, at an old ally not coming actively to her assistance; but that we decided upon neutrality as the line which this country felt bound to adopt in a struggle which they had vainly attempted to prevent; but that in that neutrality we had been actuated by the most friendly feeling compatible with its impartial duties.

The Duc de Broglie replied that France felt our conduct to be cold; that there

had been a disappointment as to our non-recognition of the Republic, and at our indifference whilst France was suffering so much; but that any questions of this nature were now resolved, and that he wished only to talk to me of the present, and future.

Her Majesty's Government had been told that M. Favre knew the terms of peace; this, the Duke added, was not the case, M. Favre did not know them at the time this was said.

The Duke said he was not well informed about them. He had seen M. Thiers after his first interview with Count Bismarck this week. It had turned exclusively upon the prolongation of the armistice which was absolutely necessary, and which had to be extracted from the Emperor and his Minister. He had also seen M. Thiers after his second interview. M. Thiers had thought it right to be reticent to him on the political and territorial questions, but he had mentioned the financial claim of six milliards, and had spoken of the absolute impossibility of meeting it, adding that it would not be honest to promise what could not be fulfilled.

The Duc de Broglie said, in these circumstances, that however much the old principles of European right were laid aside, the French Government thought they had a right to ask England whether she had no proposal to make. Speeches had been made in Parliament stating that Her Majesty's Government would not neglect a favourable opportunity of promoting a permanent peace, and the time was pressing.

He reserved to himself the right of bringing before us the territorial and political questions, but the financial subject was simple, and a matter almost of fact. Could we do nothing in this?

I explained to the Duc de Broglie the difficulties of the situation. I pointed out that our non-recognition of the Government arose from the late Government declining to call an Assembly to sanction it, a refusal which I knew M. Thiers had disapproved.

There is, moreover, a want of agreement among all of the Powers of Europe even to examine any proposal which France might make, and we were not prepared to use stronger language than that to which we intended to adhere; that individually I doubted whether any friendly advice which the Germans were adverse to receiving would not weaken whatever party there might be at Versailles in favour of moderation; that with regard to any proposals which the Duc de Broglie might make, I could answer for their being considered by my colleagues in the

most friendly spirit, and with a strong desire to do whatever might be practically useful.

I begged his Excellency to state in what way he thought we could be useful in the financial question.

The Duc de Broglie said that what he asked us to do was to demand from Germany that the armistice should be prolonged in order that the negotiations should not be withdrawn from all cognizance on the part of Europe; and that, in the second place, we should offer arbitration with respect to the amount of indemnity, which was an object of importance to the conquerors and the conquered, and a matter of deep interest to all commercial countries to whom the financial perturbation caused by an excessive sum might be of great detriment.

I promised to bring the matter before my colleagues, and the Duc de Broglie reserved his right of appealing to us with respect to the territorial and political considerations.

Your Excellency is already aware that a cabinet having been immediately summoned on the subject of the Duc de Broglie's communications to me, I informed him that, with regard to the first proposal, that Her Majesty's Government should urge Germany to prolong the armistice for the object stated by his Excellency, the Cabinet was of opinion that such a step would not promote the object which his Excellency had in view, but that Her Majesty's Government had embodied in the despatch to Lord Augustus Loftus (of which I communicated copies both to your Excellency and to the Duke) the substance of the second proposal which the French Ambassador had conveyed to me in order to arrive at a satisfactory arrangement as to the amount of indemnity to be paid by France.

I subsequently pointed out to the Duc de Broglie that, in directing Her Majesty's Ambassador at Berlin, as stated in my despatch, to make representations to Germany on the amount of indemnity demanded of France, and to tender their good offices, in the spirit of friendship, to both parties, Her Majesty's Government had been guided by the wish which his Excellency had so strongly expressed on behalf of the French Government; and I said that I had moreover asked Count Bernstorff in the evening of the 24th to telegraph to Count Bismarck, as I had myself telegraphed to Mr. Odo Russell at Versailles the substance of my despatch to Lord Augustus Loftus.

I added, with reference to a remark

that he had made to me as to the importance of time, that, as his Excellency had only arrived in the morning of the 24th, that I saw him at half-past ten, and presented him to the Queen at half-past one, after which it was necessary for me to consult my colleagues, in a cabinet specially summoned for that purpose, on the statements he had made to me, and thereupon took measures at once for making a representation to the German Government, I considered that I had shown that Her Majesty's Government, no less than his Excellency, were fully sensible of the importance of acting without delay.

I am, &c.
(Signed) GRANVILLE.

(Inclosure in No. 2.)

M. JULES FAYRE TO THE DUC DE BROGLIE.
(Communicated to Earl Granville by the Duc de Broglie, February 25.)

Paris, February 22, 1871.

M. le Comte,—I feel much satisfaction in entrusting to the Duc de Broglie the mission of Representative of France to the Government of Her Majesty the Queen of England. The assent which your Excellency has been so good as to give to this selection is a sure pledge to me that it will fulfil the sincere desire of the Chief of the Executive Power of the French Republic and of his whole cabinet, to renew with your nation the relations of friendship which have so long constituted our mutual strength, and have greatly contributed to the maintenance of peace in Europe. I cannot conceal from your Excellency that I should have been glad, in the days of our cruel trials, if this long-standing tradition had not appeared to be momentarily weakened; and yet I do not forget the kindness your Excellency has shown me, and for which I remain personally grateful to you, nor the regard which you have shown for France in postponing for her the labours of the Conference in terms by which I am deeply touched. I venture to hope that the communications which the Duc de Broglie is instructed to make to your Excellency will confirm those sentiments, and may give rise to a course of effective action, which I do not fear to solicit in the name of my country, believing it, moreover, to be in conformity alike with the interests and the feelings of the English people, calculated to be usefully subservient to their policy, and at the same time to lay the foundation of a

peace which is desirable for the sake of all Europe.

I have, &c.
(Signed) JULES FAVRE.

No. 3.

MR. ODO RUSSELL TO EARL GRANVILLE.

(Received March 6.)

Versailles, February 26, 1871.

(Extract.)

Your lordship's telegram of the 24th instant, 11.45 p.m., respecting the war indemnity, was delivered to me at eleven p.m. last night, soon after I had come

home from a visit to the Crown Prince's head-quarters, where I learnt that the war indemnity of six milliards had been reduced to five milliards, and had been agreed to by M. Thiers.

I conclude that your lordship's telegram, through Count Bernstorff, must have reached yesterday morning early, but I have not been able to see the Chancellor myself, who is too much engaged with the French negotiators to receive any one to-day.

The negotiations must be concluded before midnight, when the armistice ends, and hostilities will be resumed if the preliminaries are not accepted.

VI.

DIPLOMATIC PAPERS RELATING TO LUXEMBURG.

A CORRESPONDENCE was presented (20th Feb.) to Parliament respecting the alleged violation of the neutrality of the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg. A remonstrance on this subject by Count Bismarck was made public shortly after the appearance of the notorious Russian Circular. It attracted the more attention from its seeming assertion of a similar claim by one of the parties to a treaty to renounce its obligations without the consent of the other signataries. It must be owned that Count Bismarck's despatch, which opens the series of papers, does not warrant so unpleasant an interpretation, and the more important portion of the correspondence consists of explanations on this point between the Prussian and English Governments, ending in mutual expressions of satisfaction.

Count Bismarck, in his despatch of the 3rd of December, recalls the declaration made by the Prussian Government at the outset of the war, that it would respect the neutrality of the Grand Duchy "on the presumption that it would also be respected on the part of the French, and, as a matter of course, that it would be maintained with earnestness and goodwill by the Grand Duchy itself." He states, however, that "neither on the part of France nor on that of Luxemburg" have these presumptions been verified. He complains specifically of "the provisioning of Thionville by railway trains at night from Luxemburg, so long as the fortress remained in the hands of the French;" of the transit of French soldiers and officers "in masses" through the Grand Duchy after the surrender of Metz, for the purpose of again entering

France; and of the French vice-consul in Luxemburg having established a regular office at the railway station, where the fugitives have been provided with means and vouchers to enable them to continue their march into France to join the army of the North. More than 2000 men, he asserts, have thus been added to the French forces. He concludes that there has thus been a "flagrant violation of the neutrality of the Grand Duchy," and he announces, accordingly, "*that the Royal Government can no longer consider itself bound to any consideration of the neutrality of the Grand Duchy, in the military operations of the German army, and in the measures for the security of the German troops against the injuries inflicted on them from Luxemburg.*" At the same time, he reserves the prosecution of Prussian claims against the Grand Duchy for damages thus inflicted. A despatch from Mr. Lumley at Brussels, announcing the receipt of this circular by the Belgian Minister, expresses the interpretation which was immediately affixed to it. "The Prussian Government," he reports, "declares it considers itself no longer bound by the Treaty of May, 1867." In Luxemburg itself the declaration of the Chancellor was instantly understood in this sense. It was received as a menace to the independence of Luxemburg, and our representative at the Hague reports "numerous patriotic protests by the inhabitants of the Duchy and the Chamber of Representatives.

Lord Granville answers the circular on the 17th of December. In the expectation of explanations from France and Luxemburg he abstains from giving any opinion on the particular charges alleged,

but there are observations which the Government feel constrained to make. He notices that these charges are now, for the first time, brought before Her Majesty's Government, "and yet they are accompanied at once by a declaration of their validity" and by the announcement already quoted from Count Bismarck: "It is obvious that principles of a wide application are involved in this statement." A pressing military emergency might possibly justify in some degree measures of prevention or repression; but no such emergency has been alleged. Count Bernstorff, though speaking without instructions, believed that the circular was not intended to contain a denunciation of the Treaty of 1867; and Her Majesty's Government gladly accept this construction. "But even on this assumption it appears to Her Majesty's Government that the regular course would have been that the North German Confederation should have in the first place required from the Grand Duke of Luxembourg explanations on the whole of the charges which they had to make, and then communicated the result to the other co-signatories with a representation of the necessity that they should take into consideration the effect of a state of facts so signified." The acts complained of, however, have ceased to have any practical bearing on the issue of the war, and Her Majesty's Government assume that the circular is intended "as an indication of the displeasure of Prussia at the disregard which she alleges has been shown to her remonstrances, when, if attended to, they might have led to some practical result," and that, satisfied with this caution, Prussia will abstain from giving effect to her declaration. At the same time, Lord Granville had directed Mr. Odo Russell to ascertain "whether there could be any present intention on the part of the Prussian Government of acting on Count Bismarck's circular." Sir A. Buchanan also writes from St. Petersburg that Prince Gortschakoff had declined expressing any opinion on the circular until he had taken the Emperor's orders on the subject. The Prince said, however, he had written immediately to the Hague, "suggesting that the King should cause an inquiry to be held without delay into the case, and that if the conduct of any subordinate officer of the Luxemburg Government justified the complaints of Prussia, they should be held responsible for it, and every possible satisfaction given to the Prussian Government."

Count Bismarck, on the 24th of December, answered Lord Granville's despatch with even more than his usual vigour.

He declares that the wording of his circular "afforded no occasion" for any such supposition as that he intended a denunciation of the Treaty of 1867. "For us," he says, "the question is as to the military defence against military injuries; . . . that every Power engaged in warfare is entitled to such a defence has hitherto been uncontested by international law, and that the defence, if it is to be effectual, must take place at the proper time, lies in the nature of war." They have, however, abstained from such a defence; but if Lord Granville expresses the opinion that even in such a case the course to be taken was to appeal to the co-signatory Powers, the Count disputes the justice of the demand, and begs him "just to consider an hypothesis which was once very near becoming a reality." Suppose Marshal Mac-Mahon, checked before Sedan, had resolved to cross the Belgian frontier, and proceed thence through Luxemburg to Metz, "does the Royal English Government consider that in such a case we should have applied to the Treaty Powers, and have settled with them by diplomatic negotiation what was to be done, and in the meantime exposed our troops at Metz to the attack of the enemy's forces, doubled by the breach of neutrality? Could any English General be in doubt as to what he was to do in such a case?" He observes that the enemy of the North is still recruited by French refugees, and that the siege of Longwy is imminent; that the danger is not past. He thinks, however, these observations will prove "the perfect legality as well as necessity of our declaration," and will remove any doubt as to our views which are only directed to our own security, in a way beyond that, and not against the Grand Duchy."

Lord Granville, in acknowledging this despatch, accepts this disclaimer with satisfaction, and observes that Count Bismarck accepts in substance the interpretation he had placed on the circular, as being "an evidence of displeasure." Lord Granville had already recognized the possibility of a pressing military emergency; but any such phrase must be judged on its own merits. On the 27th of December Mr. Odo Russell states the result of the inquiries Lord Granville had instructed him to make at Versailles. He says that "both His Majesty the King and the Chancellor of the North German Confederation have assured me that the circular is a military measure for the security of the German army, and not a denunciation of the Treaty of 1867; nor is there any wish or intention on the part of Prussia to annex the Grand Duchy." "These assurances,"

he adds, were given him, "in language calculated to convey conviction" to his mind. Another despatch from Count Bismarck, and a report by Lord Granville of corresponding statements made to him by Count Bernstorff, conclude the discussion between the British and German Governments:—

Versailles, January 20, 1871.

Herewith I send your Excellency a copy of a despatch dated the 7th of January inst., addressed by Lord Granville to Mr. Odo Russell, and communicated by the latter to me, in answer to my despatch to your Excellency of the 21st. It affords me satisfaction to see that Lord Granville acknowledges that our despatch of the 3rd of December was not founded on any intention of denouncing the Treaty of 1867, and that it relates only to military measures of defence against the injuries arising from the violation of the neutrality, which measures, as the royal British Secretary of State admits, may be justified by the state of affairs. Under these circumstances I quite agree with Lord Granville that in the particular case the question only depends on the actual state of affairs, and further discussion would be superfluous. I request your Excellency to tell the royal British Secretary of State this, and to express my thanks for his communication. "VON BISMARCK."

In addition, the papers contain the correspondence between M. Servais, the Minister-President of the Luxembourg Government, and Count Bismarck. It is unnecessary to enter into the details of the accusation and defence, the more so as the correspondence ends with the very reasonable proposal by Count Bismarck, which was at once accepted by M. Servais, that a special Plenipotentiary should be sent to Luxembourg "to enter into a consideration with the Grand Ducal Government as to the means by which a recur-

rence of the errors that have occurred may be prevented in future." M. Servais writes with equal fairness and moderation, and makes out a very good case. To our Minister at the Hague he observes that, at the commencement of the war, fearing these difficulties, he suggested "the appointment in the Grand Duchy of agents" who might ascertain the authenticity of facts alleged by either belligerent. This offer was declined by our Government, and M. Servais bases on this a claim for the acceptance of his statements. He also points out "that the neutrality conferred on certain States in Europe would no longer have any real existence, if the existence of a State constituted as neutral in virtue of a treaty could depend on the will of a single one of the contracting Powers." He observes, with some reason, that since the Treaty of 1867 restricted the Luxembourg forces to the numbers necessary to maintain order, allowances should be made for any apparent failure to deal with large numbers of foreign soldiers. He proves, too, that his Government had taken numerous precautions, for some of which they had received the thanks of the Prussian Minister, and that the Prussians as well as the French had infringed the neutrality of the Duchy. At the same time the French Minister in Brussels avows to Mr. Lumley that he, of his own authority, had sent the provisions in question to Thionville, with a view of relieving Bazaine's army in the event of its breaking through the German lines. The impression created by this part of the correspondence is, in short, that the complaints of the Prussian Government were exaggerated, that the Luxembourg Government did its best to observe neutrality, but that it was very difficult for it to avoid being compromised by others—both Germans and French.

VII.

LORD LYONS AND THE BRITISH RESIDENTS IN PARIS.

AMONG the Parliamentary papers of the Session relating to the war appeared a correspondence between the Foreign Office and Lord Lyons respecting the departure of the Ambassador from Paris and the provision made for the withdrawal of British subjects. The last letter of the series is dated Bordeaux, February 26, and contains Lord Lyons' answer to the

charges made against him in Parliament. He writes:—

"I perceive that observations have been made in both Houses of Parliament on the fact of my having left Paris in the month of September last, and on the steps which I took to provide for the protection of British subjects there during my absence.

"I do not think it necessary to say

much here on the first point. I was advised to remove to Tours by M. Jules Favre, and pressed to accompany them to that place by the representatives of the Great Powers of Europe. I travelled to Tours with the representatives of Austria, Italy, Russia, and Turkey, and we were followed immediately by the Spanish Charge d'Affaires, and afterwards by the representatives of other Powers. In fact, the only chief of a diplomatic mission from a great Power who stayed in Paris was Mr. Washburne, the United States Minister. As representing a nation which punctiliously abstains from taking part in the political affairs of Europe, Mr. Washburne had not the same reasons as the representatives of European Powers for removing to a place at which he could serve as a means of communication between his Government and the Government of France; and, as being charged with the protection of North German subjects in France, he was allowed by the German military authorities facilities for correspondence during the siege which were denied to the representatives of other Governments. I conceived at the time that it was my duty neither to reject the advice of the French Minister for Foreign Affairs nor to separate myself from my principal colleagues, and I thought it would be on all accounts inexpedient for me to allow myself to be shut up in Paris and to be deprived of all speedy and satisfactory means of communicating with your lordship. My subsequent experience has, I confess, confirmed me in these opinions. On the day after I left Paris, all communication by road with that place was intercepted, and on the following day the last telegraphic wire was cut. The diplomatists who were left in the besieged city were refused by the German authorities positively all facilities for corresponding with their Governments otherwise than by letters left open for the inspection of those authorities. My having resided at the seat of the Delegation of the Government at Tours, and having followed them to Bourdeaux, have been accepted by the French as manifest proofs of the desire of Her Majesty's Government to maintain intimate and friendly relations with them, while my doing so has afforded Her Majesty's Government the readiest and most effectual means of maintaining such relations in fact.

"On the question of the provision made by me for the protection of British subjects when I myself left Paris, it may perhaps be desirable that I should make some explanation in addition to the reports which I addressed to your lordship at the time. The objections made

against the course I took appear to resolve themselves into a complaint that I did not leave Mr. Atlee the Consul at Paris, instead of or in addition to Mr. Wodehouse, one of the Secretaries of the Embassy.

"What happened was this. When it became apparent that an attack upon Paris was imminent I naturally became desirous of reducing the number of members of the Embassy whom I kept with me there to the lowest point compatible with the performance of the work. Much of the ordinary business, and in particular the not inconsiderable part of it caused by the passage of Queen's messengers, and the necessity of transmitting without delay despatches brought by them, was sure to be suspended by the siege; consequently, I thought that the services of two of the members of the Chancery might be temporarily dispensed with. It so happened that two of these had wives and families, while the rest were unmarried. I therefore selected, as most proper to send away, the two married men, of whom Mr. Atlee was one.

"As your lordship is aware, although Mr. Atlee holds a commission as Consul, his principal functions are those of Attaché Librarian and Registrar to the Embassy. In ordinary times there are some technical advantages in having a person with the character of Consul in immediate connexion with the Embassy, among which may be reckoned his collecting, on account of Her Majesty's Government, Consular fees, which considerably exceed in amount the Consular salary allowances.

"Under the circumstances, however, under which my departure took place, there were certainly no special functions which could be better discharged by a Consul than by a Secretary of the Embassy. I had no power to take out of the hands of the committee of the British Charitable Fund the management of the charitable contributions for the relief of distressed British subjects. I had most certainly no wish to do so. On the contrary, I had the fullest confidence in the members of that committee, whom the most generous motives induced to stay in Paris; and the noble and unwearied devotion with which they have discharged the benevolent duties they undertook have more than justified the high opinion I had formed of them. In fact, the object which rendered the presence of a member of the Embassy in Paris desirable was that he should communicate officially with the French Government and exercise an influence with them on behalf of Her Majesty's subjects; and it appeared to me that I should better provide for the attainment of this object by presenting a secretary to

the Minister for Foreign Affairs as representative of the Embassy than by simply leaving a Consul in the town. I accordingly presented Mr. Wodehouse to M. Jules Favre in that capacity. In fact, while Mr. Wodehouse could perfectly well perform all the functions that could be discharged by a Consul, he was in a much better position than a Consul could have been for communicating efficiently with the Minister for Foreign Affairs or other French authorities.

"I was naturally anxious not to expose any of Her Majesty's servants unnecessarily, and I conceived that by stationing Mr. Wodehouse and General Claremont, the Military Attaché at Paris, I made the best provision in my power for the protection of the British subjects who remained there.

"I left with Mr. Wodehouse orders to come away from Paris himself if the place should be threatened with immediate bombardment, and in that case to do his utmost to obtain a safe passage out for all British subjects. I considered that in such a contingency the protection of any of our countrymen who might still remain could not be transferred to better hands than to those of General Claremont, who, from his intimacy with General Trochu, and his large acquaintance among French military men and well-known influence with them, would have peculiar means of befriending and assisting British subjects, if actual danger from military operations should be imminent."

VIII.

THE BLACK SEA CONFERENCE.

PROTOCOLS OF CONFERENCES HELD IN LONDON RESPECTING THE TREATY OF MARCH 30, 1856.

(Translation).

PROTOCOL No. 1.

Sitting of January 17, 1871.

Present :

For North Germany—
Count de Bernstorff, &c. ;

For Austria-Hungary—
Count Apponyi, &c. ;

For Great Britain—
Earl Granville, &c. ;

For Italy—
The Chevalier Ch. Cadorna, &c. ;

For Russia—
Baron de Brunnow, &c. ;

For Turkey—
Musurus Pasha, &c.

The Plenipotentiaries of North Germany, of Austria-Hungary, of Great Britain, of Italy, of Russia, and of Turkey, met to-day in Conference at the Foreign Office.

The sitting is opened by his Excellency Musurus Pasha, who proposes that the Presidency of the Conference should be entrusted to Earl Granville in the following terms :—

"Gentlemen,—Being met in Conference for the examination of a question of high importance, our first duty is to pro-

ceed to the choice of our President. As you have been so good as to permit me to speak on this occasion, I have the honour to propose to you to entrust the Presidency of this assembly to his Excellency Earl Granville, Principal Secretary of State of Her Majesty the Queen for Foreign Affairs.

"Not only is this an act of respect due to the august Sovereign under whose auspices we are called upon to fulfil an important mission, but it is at the same time an expression of the confidence which is inspired in our Governments and in all of us by the eminent qualities which render the noble Lord so well fitted to give the best direction to the labours of the Conference, and by the enlightened solicitude with which he has applied himself since the commencement of the incident which is to occupy our attention, to preparing the way for a solution in conformity with international law and with the general desire for the preservation of peace."

This proposal having been unanimously adopted, Earl Granville assumes the Presidency, and expresses himself as follows :—

"I hasten to thank the Turkish Ambassador for the kind manner in which he has brought forward the proposal which

you, gentlemen, have been so good as to agree to.

"I propose to you, gentlemen, to entrust to Mr. Stuart the drawing up of the Protocols of the Conference."

This proposal having also been agreed to, Mr. Stuart is introduced, and the Plenipotentiaries proceed to the verification of their respective powers, which are found in good and due form.

Earl Granville then resumes:

"I am deeply sensible," he says, "of the honour which you have done me in calling on me to be President of this Conference.

"At the moment of commencing the discussion of a great European question in which France is deeply interested, and for which she has formerly made great sacrifices, I cannot but express my great regret, which I am sure, gentlemen, is shared by you, at not seeing her represented among us to-day.

"But M. Jules Favre, designated as Plenipotentiary of France, not being able to be present at our meeting to-day, it only remains to me to propose to you that we should record by general agreement our hope that the French Plenipotentiary will eventually adhere to any decision to be taken in this sitting, and that I should be permitted to communicate confidentially to the *Chargé d'Affaires* of France the details of our labours to-day."

The Plenipotentiaries having declared their complete assent on these points, Earl Granville continues:—

"The Conference has been accepted by all the co-signatory Powers of the Treaty of 1856, for the purpose of examining without any foregone conclusion and of discussing with perfect freedom the proposals which Russia desires to make to us with regard to the revision which she asks of the stipulations of the said Treaty relative to the neutralization of the Black Sea.

"This unanimity furnishes a striking proof that the Powers recognize that it is an essential principle of the law of nations that none of them can liberate itself from the engagements of a treaty, nor modify the stipulations thereof, unless with the consent of the contracting parties by means of an amicable understanding.

"This important principle appears to me to meet with general acceptance, and I have the honour to propose to you, gentlemen, to sign a Protocol *ad hoc*."

The Protocol in question is then submitted to the Conference and signed by all the Plenipotentiaries, who further decide that it shall be annexed to the general Protocol of the present sitting, and that on his arrival, the Plenipoten-

tiary of France shall be requested to add his signature to it.

After expressing how much he shares in the regret of the President at not seeing France represented at the meeting of to-day, the Plenipotentiary of Turkey declares that he has agreed in the name of his Government to the principle laid down by the President with so much the more readiness, inasmuch as the Sublime Porte has, on all occasions, recognized its binding character, and has constantly conformed its policy thereto in its relations with foreign nations.

The Plenipotentiary of Austria-Hungary says that the imperial and royal Government has not hesitated to accept the meeting of this Conference, which has been called to give a fresh pledge for the faith of treaties and for the principles as well as the interests which they are designed to secure.

He adds that it is in a spirit of conciliation and of equitable appreciation that the Government of His Imperial and Royal Apostolic Majesty has charged him to enter into the examination of the questions with which the Conference is to be occupied. These sentiments are the more in conformity with the intentions of the Austro-Hungarian Government as it sees in them the means of once more placing on record, by means of an impartial examination, the agreement of the Powers on the important questions which form the object of the Treaty signed at Paris on the 30th of March, 1856.

The Plenipotentiary of Italy is rejoiced at the agreement of the Powers resulting from the Protocol which has just been signed, and at the declarations of the Plenipotentiaries, in which he hastens to join. Italy will be happy to lend her hearty assistance to the important work of general interest for which the Conference has met, and to enter upon it in the fullest spirit of equity and conciliation.

On the invitation of the President, the Plenipotentiary of Russia speaks. He requests the permission of the Conference to read a summary which he wishes to be inserted in the Protocol—

"The Plenipotentiary of Russia recapitulated the circumstances and facts which, since the signature of the Treaty concluded at Paris on the 13th of March, 1856, have induced the Powers who signed it to give their assent to different modifications which have contributed to alter in part the letter of the original stipulations.

"He instanced specially the precedent of the Conferences held at different periods at Paris, and cited the decisions,

adopted by general agreement with the view of modifying the Government of the Principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia—an alteration which received the sanction of the Sublime Porte, as well as the assent of the other contracting Powers.

“He affirmed that these deviations from the Treaty have exercised no influence on the firm intention of the Emperor to maintain intact the general principles of the Treaty of 1856, which have defined the position of Turkey in the system of Europe.

“After having explained the views of his august master on this subject, the Plenipotentiary of Russia pointed out how much the present situation of Europe differs from that which existed at the time of the Congress of Paris.

“At the present moment, taking into serious consideration the changes gradually produced by the course of time, the Plenipotentiary of Russia thinks the conclusion must be drawn that it would be an act of prudent and wise policy to submit the stipulations of 1856, relative to the navigation of the Black Sea, to a revision guided by an unanimous sentiment of equity and concord.

“In fact, these stipulations, suggested at another period under the influence of conjunctures entirely different from the present situation, are no longer in harmony with the relations of good neighbourhood which exist at this moment between the two Riverain Powers.

“Further, the Plenipotentiary of Russia, in conformity with the instructions with which he is provided, declared that his august master attaches a just importance to this revision in the double interest of the security and of the dignity of his empire.

“In acquitting himself of the orders of his Court on this point, he expressed the hope that the new arrangements resulting from this revision will contribute to the confirmation of peace, which forms the subject of general solicitude on the part of all the great Powers whose Representatives are assembled in Conference in London.”

The Plenipotentiary of Turkey says that he appreciates the spirit of conciliation which has dictated the statement of the Plenipotentiary of Russia, and that, animated by the same conciliatory spirit, he will abstain from discussing certain points of that statement on which he differs, and reserves the opinion of his Government.

He observes, however, that the Sublime Porte regards the incident submitted to the consideration of the Conference from a higher point of view; that, in

fact, His Imperial Majesty the Sultan desires to maintain with His Majesty the Emperor of Russia the best relations of friendship and good neighbourhood; and that, above all, the Sublime Porte is anxious to give, in the present circumstances, a proof of its conciliatory disposition and of its solicitude for the cause of peace, by joining in the examination of a question which equally concerns other great Powers, and which might otherwise lead to complications which it is in the general interest to prevent.

He declares that it is with this desire and with these views that his august Master has commanded him to represent his Government in the Conference.

He concludes by begging the President to be so good as to postpone the next sitting for some days, with the consent of the other members of the Conference, in order that he may have time to consider the proposal of the Plenipotentiary of Russia.

The Plenipotentiary of North Germany says that he is anxious to place on record, at the opening of the Conference, that the Government of the King his august master, in being the first to propose a meeting in Conference of the Plenipotentiaries of the Powers who signed the Treaty of Paris of March 30, 1856, has done so in a spirit of conciliation, of equity, and of peace, and that it is in this same spirit that his Court has instructed him to support and to recommend to the serious consideration of the Plenipotentiaries of the other Powers represented in the Conference the desire of the Imperial Government of Russia to see the stipulations of 1856, relative to the navigation of the Black Sea, submitted to a revision which should eliminate certain clauses, the restrictive character of which, as regards the exercise of the rights of sovereignty of the two Riverain Powers, seems rather calculated to maintain a state of uneasiness between them than to confirm more and more, as is essentially desirable for the maintenance of tranquillity in the East, the relations of good neighbourhood which are happily established between the two Powers, and of which the Plenipotentiaries of Russia and Turkey have both of them just given evidence.

His Majesty's Government has been guided in this incident by the desire of bringing about, on the questions connected with the navigation of the Black Sea, a general understanding between the great Powers of Europe, which cannot but contribute powerfully to the security of the East and to the maintenance of the independence and integrity of the Ottoman

Empire, which all the Powers who signed the Treaty of Paris of March 30, 1856, desire to secure. The instructions which have been given him consequently desire him to enter with entire impartiality and perfect freedom of judgment on the discussion of the proposals which may be submitted on either side to the Conference, and to regard them solely with a view to the harmony of Europe, and to the present and future preservation of peace in the East.

Referring to the proposal of adjournment made by the Plenipotentiary of Turkey, Earl Granville says that he joins in it the more willingly as the Conference having only been occupied to-day with the question of principle, this adjournment will, he hopes, afford an opportunity for the Plenipotentiary of France to arrive and take part in the discussion of the stipulations of the Treaty of 1856, relating to the neutralization of the Black Sea, which is to take place in the next sitting.

He renders justice to the sentiments which suggested to Prussia the idea of the Conference. Still, with a view to a clear definition of the facts, he thinks it right to remark that the first idea was to hold it at St. Petersburg, and that it was only accepted on condition that the place of meeting should be changed, and that it should be entered upon without foregone conclusion, and with perfect freedom of discussion.

He congratulates himself on the principle of equity and conciliation with which the discussion of to-day has been pervaded. He draws from it a good omen for the result of the examination which the Conference is to make of some of the stipulations of the Treaty of 1856, with a view to their revision.

After having engaged to observe secrecy on all that may pass in the Conference, the Plenipotentiaries separate, agreeing that their next meeting shall take place on Tuesday, January 2^d, at one o'clock.

(Signed) BERNSTORFF.
APPONY.
GRANVILLE.
CADORNA.
BRUNNOW.
MUSURUS.

ANNEX.

The Plenipotentiaries of North Germany, of Austria-Hungary, of Great Britain, of Italy, of Russia, and of Turkey, assembled to-day in Conference, recognize that it is an essential principle of the law of nations that no power can liberate itself from the engagements of a treaty, nor modify the stipulations thereof, unless

with the consent of the contracting Powers by means of an amicable arrangement.

In faith of which the said Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Protocol.

Done at London, the 17th January, 1871.

(Signed) BERNSTORFF.
APPONY.
GRANVILLE.
CADORNA.
BRUNNOW.
MUSURUS.
BROGLIE.

March 13, 1871.

PROTOCOL No. 2.

Sitting of January 24, 1871.

After the signature of the Protocol of the first sitting, Count de Bernstorff observes that his august Sovereign having changed his title since that sitting, he can no longer be designated as Plenipotentiary of North Germany, and he requests to be designated in the future Protocols as Plenipotentiary of Germany.

The Russian Ambassador hastens to announce that he has received the orders of his Court to recognize, in the name of His Majesty the Emperor, the Imperial title which His Majesty the King of Prussia has now assumed.

The request of the Plenipotentiary of Germany is also agreed to by all the other Plenipotentiaries.

The Plenipotentiary of Turkey says that he has examined the proposal of the Plenipotentiary of Russia, which has for its object the revision of the stipulations of March 30, 1856, relative to the neutralization of the Black Sea; but that before expressing an opinion upon this proposal, he would wish that Baron de Brunnow would be so good as to define it.

In reply to this request, the Plenipotentiary of Russia reads to the Conference the following summary:—

“The statement which I had the honour to place before the Conference at its first sitting affirms that the stipulations relative to the navigation of the Black Sea were suggested in 1856 under the influence of conjunctures entirely different from the present state of affairs.

“A few words will suffice to establish the contrast between the two periods, of which I am witness.

“In the month of February, 1856, I was called to the Conference of Paris. That was fifteen years ago: it was in the time of the Empire.

“Count Walewski presided over the labours of the Congress. That Minister is

no more. The authority of which he was the organ has fallen. These considerations impose on my language a reserve, the motives for which you will appreciate.

"Allow me, gentlemen, to resume the situation, such as it was at the period when Count Orloff and I entered the Congress of Paris.

"Russia was at war with France; she was at war with England; she was at war with Italy; she was at war with Turkey.

"I am now called upon to take part in the deliberations of a Conference in which are assembled the Representatives of Powers with whom Russia maintains relations of peace and of good understanding.

"I pass to the examination of the stipulations relative to the navigation of the Black Sea. Permit me to express myself with frankness on the imperfection of the documents which I shall submit to your notice.

"I will commence by reading to you Article XI. It runs as follows:—

"The Black Sea is neutralized: its waters and its ports, thrown open to the mercantile marine of every nation, are formally and in perpetuity interdicted to the flag of war, either of the Powers possessing its coasts, or of any other Power, &c."

"Here, I will allow myself to make a first observation: Article XI. is so drawn up as to establish, in appearance, an equality between the flag of war of the Riverain Powers and that of every other Power. The assertion is incorrect. The equality does not exist. The flag of war of the non-Riverain Powers has never been admitted into the Black Sea in time of peace. The reason for this is very simple. The entry of the Dardanelles and of the Bosphorus is closed to the flag of war of all foreign Powers. The closing of the Straits, maintained and confirmed by Article X., has absolutely nothing in common with the interdiction established by Article XI.

"That interdiction affects solely the flag of the two Riverain Powers.

"Let us examine the effect and scope of this interdiction. It deprives Russia and Turkey alike of the prerogative which they enjoyed of freely exhibiting their military flag in the Black Sea.

"Now the territories by which that sea is surrounded form an integral part of the dominions of the two Riverain Powers.

"The liberty of navigation is inherent to the sovereign right of each of the two States.

"To forbid them that navigation is to encroach upon their independence.

"Observe, moreover, that Article XI. gives to this interdiction a character which exceeds the bounds of possibility. It says, 'the waters and the ports' (of the Black Sea) 'are in perpetuity interdicted to the flag of war of the Powers possessing its coasts.' It must be admitted the expression 'in perpetuity' was not happily chosen. In the order of human affairs, it is in the power of no one to proscribe or to deny the action of time.

"Has the reign, of which the memory is connected with the instruments of the Congress of Paris, itself stood the test of time?

"This reflection leads me to a conclusion which I do not hesitate to express with perfect frankness.

"The moment appears to me to have arrived when sound policy suggests that we should substitute new combinations for those which are no longer in keeping with the actual state of affairs.

"In fact a situation false from its origin always entails consequences which end sooner or later by producing the seeds of discord and of troubles. The principle of neutralization, proclaimed in 1856, had the essential defect, as I have said, of inflicting a serious injury on the independence of the rights of sovereignty of the Riverain Powers. It was a fruitless attempt to introduce into international law an innovation which possessed in itself no chance of duration.

"Far from consolidating the tranquillity of the Levant, the stipulations of 1856, relative to the navigation of the Black Sea, tended to perpetuate a cause of irritation calculated to wound deeply the national feeling of Russia. I say this without recrimination: I assert it, simply and straightforwardly, because it is true.

"In the interest, rightly understood, of the maintenance of peace, it is expedient, according to my convictions, to consider the means of putting an end to an abnormal state of affairs, calculated to lead to serious difficulties, if they are not wisely prevented in time.

"With this object my instructions direct me to leave to the Ambassador of Turkey the initiation of the arrangements to be devised, by general agreement, to replace the stipulations of 1856 relative to the neutralization of the Black Sea, with the object of securing the tranquillity of the East, and the balance of power in Europe.

"In order to define the limits within which I consider that I should confine myself, according to the orders of my Court, in the accomplishment of the task confided to me, I have the honour to submit for revision by the Conference the

tenor of the Articles of the Treaty of March 3rd, 1856, mentioned below:—

“ARTICLE XI.

“The Black Sea is neutralized, its waters and its ports, thrown open to the mercantile marine of every nation, are formally and in perpetuity interdicted to the flag of war, either of the Powers possessing its coasts, or of any other Power, with the exceptions mentioned in Articles XIV. and XIX. of the present Treaty.

“ARTICLE XIII.

“The Black Sea being neutralized according to the terms of Article XI., the maintenance or establishment upon its coast of military maritime arsenals becomes alike unnecessary and purposeless; in consequence, His Majesty the Emperor of all the Russias and His Imperial Majesty the Sultan engage not to establish or to maintain upon that coast any military maritime arsenal.

“ARTICLE XIV.

“Their Majesties the Emperor of all the Russias and the Sultan having concluded a Convention for the purpose of settling the force and the number of light vessels necessary for the service of their coasts, which they reserve to themselves to maintain in the Black Sea, that Convention is annexed to the present Treaty, and shall have the same force and validity as if it formed an integral part thereof. It cannot be either annulled or modified without the assent of the Powers signing the present Treaty.

—
“Convention relative to the Number and the Force of the Vessels of War which the Riveran Powers shall maintain in the Black Sea.

“ARTICLE I.

“The High Contracting Parties mutually engage not to have in the Black Sea any other vessels of war than those of which the number, the force, and the dimensions are hereinafter stipulated.

“ARTICLE II.

“The High Contracting Parties reserve to themselves each to maintain in that sea six steam-vessels of fifty metres in length at the line of flotation, of a tonnage of eight hundred tons at the maximum, and four light steam or sailing-vessels, of a tonnage which shall not exceed two hundred tons each.

“ARTICLE III.

“The present Convention, annexed to the General Treaty signed at Paris this day, shall be ratified, and the ratifications shall be exchanged in the space of four weeks, or sooner, if possible.”

At the conclusion of this paper, the Plenipotentiary of Turkey expresses himself in these terms:—

“For fear that a polemic introduced into our deliberations should alter the courteous tone which has pervaded the explanations in which the Plenipotentiary of Russia has developed the motives of the statement which he submitted to the Conference in our first sitting, I hesitate to enlarge upon the facts and the reasons which justify my Government in not joining in the criticisms directed against stipulations improperly characterized, in my opinion, as derogatory to the independence of the Riveran Powers. It will be sufficient for me to observe that there are many examples of neighbouring States who have felt the advantage of mutually imposing on themselves certain restrictions with the view of living in harmony. It is the same with these restrictions as with the obligations stipulated between proprietors of contiguous domains for their mutual convenience. By taking care not to place opposing forces in presence of one another, a dangerous collision is often avoided.

“On the other hand, the Treaty of 1856 is of too recent a date to allow of changes having been produced by the course of time fitted to weaken the reasons for the stipulations relative to the neutralization of the Black Sea, the more so as that sea is an internal one, removed from the action of European events. Moreover, the application of the stipulations, far from having given rise to difficulties, has contributed hitherto to the maintenance of peace in that part of the East. Hence the Sublime Porte is fully satisfied with these stipulations, which all the great Powers decided on by general agreement after prolonged discussion. It attaches great value to their maintenance, and however sincere may be its desire to remove any thing which may be a subject of irritation and uneasiness in the relations of friendliness and mutual confidence of two powerful neighbouring States, it cannot but regret that the Imperial Government of Russia should see, in the maintenance of these stipulations, an obstacle to the consolidation of the tranquillity of the East, and a cause of irritation tending to wound deeply the national feeling of Russia.

“However, in a question of such great

importance, the Sublime Porte does not think it ought to consult its own interests exclusively, without taking into account the interests and views of other great Powers, its friends and allies, to whose efforts and assistance it owes in great part the work which it is now proposed to modify. Having had the honour to be accredited to Her Majesty the Queen for a great number of years, I am in a position to know that England has always agreed in the views of the Sublime Porte as regards the neutralization of the Black Sea. But it is possible that other great Powers, equally friends and allies of the Sublime Porte, and not less interested in the welfare of the Ottoman Empire, may be of a different opinion. Already, in our last sitting, the Plenipotentiary of Germany declared that he was instructed by his Court to support and to recommend to the serious consideration of the other Powers the desire of the Imperial Government of Russia to see the stipulations relative to the neutralization of the Black Sea submitted to a revision which should deprive them of their restrictive character.

"It has thus become incumbent on the Sublime Porte to provide for the case of the co-signatory Powers considering it to be in the general interest to agree to the demand of the Imperial Government of Russia. Animated by a conciliatory disposition, and desirous of saving Europe from the complications which might result from a serious dissension between the Powers who signed the Treaty of 1856, the Porte will not hesitate, in this case, to give a proof of its moderation and of its sincere anxiety for the cause of peace.

"I have, therefore, the honour to inform the Plenipotentiaries, that if their Governments should think fit to admit the demand of the Plenipotentiary of Russia relative to the Special Convention concluded between the two Riverian Powers, and mentioned in Article XIV. of the Treaty of March 30, 1856, as well as Articles XI., XIII., and XIV. of that Treaty, while substituting for the guarantees resulting from that Convention and those Articles equivalent guarantees compatible with the rights and security of the Ottoman Empire, I am authorized, in virtue of the instructions with which I am provided, to agree to their decision in as far as concerns the revision of the Convention and Articles before mentioned, but that my instructions direct me to make known in that case to the Conference the guarantees which, as the condition of its consent, the Sublime Porte would demand in substitution for the present guarantees."

The Plenipotentiary of Austria-Hungary thinks he may conclude, from what has been said by the Plenipotentiary of Turkey, that the Sublime Porte, guided by sentiments and considerations which cannot be sufficiently appreciated, would not refuse to join in the resolutions which may be come to by the Conference with regard to those of the stipulations of the Treaty of March 30, 1856, which established the neutralization of the Black Sea, making it, however, a condition that means of compensation should be found to serve as equivalents for the concession required of Turkey.

Count Apponyi adds that he takes note of these declarations of the Ottoman Plenipotentiary, and that he gives them his full adhesion in the name of his Government.

The Plenipotentiary of Great Britain, having listened with attention to the dignified and conciliatory remarks of Musurus Pasha, and while appreciating the preliminary hesitation of the Sublime Porte as regards the decision which his Excellency has announced to the Conference, hastens to declare that he supports the resolution at which the Government of His Majesty the Sultan has definitely arrived.

As to the allusion made by the Plenipotentiary of Turkey to the opinions contrary to the neutralization of the Black Sea which may have been expressed by several of the contracting parties of the Treaty of 1856, Earl Granville remarks that in England, at the time of the Treaty, opinions opposed to that arrangement had in fact been pronounced by some political personages. He is not himself of the way of thinking of those who then opposed it. He admits, however, that the objections of the Plenipotentiary of Russia to the words "in perpetuity" seem to him to have some force.

The conditions in question seem to the Plenipotentiary of Great Britain to have been reasonable, considering the moment when they were drawn up, at the end of an important war. They have given Turkey the opportunity, during fourteen years, of insuring her independence and security by measures of civil, military, and naval administration. In this state of affairs, Russia, while admitting the obligations imposed by international law, expresses now to the co-signatories of the Treaty of 1856 her desire to be freed from these engagements. He concludes, therefore, by declaring that the Government of Her Majesty the Queen, in concert with all the co-signatories of the said Treaty, is ready to sign a Convention which should effect the changes pointed

out by the Plenipotentiary of Russia, on condition that fitting equivalents can be found.

The Plenipotentiary of Italy declares that, in accordance with the instructions which he has received from his Government, and in consequence of the acceptance by the Sublime Porte of the principle of the revision, in exchange for an equivalent, of Articles XI., XIII., and XIV. of the Treaty of 1856, and of the Separate Convention between Russia and Turkey annexed thereto, he joins in the acceptance by the Plenipotentiaries of that principle and of the condition with which it has been coupled.

Some of the Plenipotentiaries having requested the adjournment of the Conference, in order to have time to receive instructions from their Courts, it is decided that this adjournment shall take place.

Before separating, the Plenipotentiary of Great Britain repeats the regret which he had expressed in the preceding sitting at the absence of the French Plenipotentiary, and the importance which he attaches to France adhering to the decisions taken by the Conference.

The Plenipotentiaries declare that the wish expressed in the last sitting on the subject of the adhesion of France, and the permission granted to the President to communicate their deliberations confidentially to the *Chargé d'Affaires* of France, apply to all the sittings of the Conference at which the Plenipotentiary of France is not present.

In proposing to put off the next meeting of the Conference to Tuesday, January 31, Earl Granville expresses the hope that this delay may allow of a French Plenipotentiary being present at it.

(Signed)

BERNSTORFF.
APPONY.
GRANVILLE.
CADORNA.
BRUNNOW.
MUSURUS.

PROTOCOL No. 3.

Sitting of February 3, 1871.

The Conference fixed originally for the 31st of January took place on the 3rd of February.

The Protocol of the preceding sitting is read and approved.

The President reminds the Plenipotentiaries that after the last sitting they discussed together, in an unofficial and friendly manner, the means of agreeing on an equivalent to be substituted for the stipulations of the Treaty of Paris relative to the neutralization of the Black Sea,

and that it was arranged that the following Articles of a Draft of Treaty should be examined in the present sitting:—

ARTICLE I.

The principle of the closing of the Straits of the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles in time of peace, invariably established as the ancient rule of the Ottoman Empire, and confirmed by the Treaty of Paris of March 30, 1856, remains in full force.

ARTICLE II.

His Imperial Majesty the Sultan, by virtue of the right of sovereignty which he exercises over the Straits of the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles, reserves to himself in time of peace the power of opening them by way of temporary exception, in case only that the interests of the security of his Empire should cause him to recognize the necessity of the presence of the vessels of war of the non-Riverain Powers.

ARTICLE III.

It is agreed that the stipulation contained in the preceding Article shall for the future replace those of Articles XI., XIII., and XIV. of the Treaty of Paris of March 30, 1856, as well as the Special Convention concluded between the Sublime Porte and Russia, and annexed to the said Article XIV.

ARTICLE IV.

The High Contracting Parties renew and confirm all the stipulations of the Treaty of March 30, 1856, as well as of its Annexes, which are not annulled or modified by the present Treaty.

The Plenipotentiary of Turkey speaks, and expresses himself as follows:—

"I have been able to submit to my Government the four Articles of which the President has just laid the draft before us; and my instructions allow of my informing the Plenipotentiaries that the Sublime Porte would see no difficulty in assenting to them, if at the end of Article II. the words 'non-Riverain Powers' were replaced by the words 'friendly Powers.'

"By this amendment Article II. would be worded as follows:—'His Imperial Majesty the Sultan, in virtue of the right of sovereignty which he exercises over the Straits of the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles, reserves to himself in time of peace the power of opening them by way of temporary exception, in case only that the

interests of the security of his Empire should cause him to recognize the necessity of the presence of the vessels of war of the friendly Powers;—and the wording which I propose would fulfil the object of Article II. of the Draft; for, if it is believed that the security of the Ottoman Empire is only menaced from the side of Russia, it is evidently only to the vessels of war of the non-Riverain Powers that the Sublime Porte will open the two Straits.

“Permit me, gentlemen, to explain to you in a few words the reasons which compel me to submit this amendment to you.

“In the first place, the wording of the Draft contains a restriction of the rights of sovereignty and independence of the Ottoman Empire; and I entertain the hope that the Plenipotentiaries, who have thought it expedient to suppress the stipulations relative to the neutralization of the Black Sea, for the very reason that they contained clauses restrictive of the rights of sovereignty of the two Riverain Powers, will not think it just to offer to the Sublime Porte, in return for its consent and by way of equivalent, a right tied down by a clause equally restrictive and exclusively affecting its rights of sovereignty.

“In the second place, I will take the liberty of observing that the wording of the Draft has, further, the appearance of being directed against Russia. As I had the honour of declaring in the last sitting, the Sublime Porte, which would doubtless have preferred that the stipulations relative to the neutralization of the Black Sea should have been maintained, nevertheless desires sincerely to see removed every subject of uneasiness and irritation in the relations of friendship and good neighbourhood between the two Riverain Powers. Now the wording of the Draft contains, in my opinion, the same germ of uneasiness and irritation between these two Powers, it is calculated to wound or offend Russia; it represents Turkey as having to maintain an attitude of constant distrust towards that Power; it might be interpreted as placing on record, in a public and solemn instrument, the existence of an antagonism between the co-signatory Powers.

“I hope, therefore, that the Plenipotentiaries will be pleased, in a spirit of equity, to adopt an amendment which, while fulfilling the same end, would remove whatever restrictive and exclusive features attach to the proposed wording.”

The Plenipotentiary of Austria-Hungary supports the original form of Article II. of the Draft; and proposes, in order

to make the wording more clear, to add after “non-Riverain Powers” the words “of the Black Sea.” He reserves to himself the right of proposing the addition to the Treaty of certain Articles relating to the Danube, which he has already communicated confidentially to his colleagues; and he points out that these Articles ought to precede Article IV. of the Draft, in order to be logically comprised in the modifications to be introduced into the Treaty of Paris.

The Plenipotentiary of Germany adheres to the Articles of the Draft, and expresses a wish that those among the Plenipotentiaries who are more especially interested in Count d’Apponyi’s amendment should first pronounce themselves on that subject.

The Plenipotentiary of Russia observes that the four Articles of the Draft form a certain entirety, and that it would be better not to separate them.

The Plenipotentiary of Great Britain is of opinion that the Conference will probably agree on the question of the prolongation of the European Commission of the Danube, and that, in that case, the Articles attaching to it ought to precede instead of following Article IV. He proposes, therefore, to the Plenipotentiary of Austro-Hungary to give his consent to the four Articles, with the reservation that the arrangement which he has asked for shall be made later.

The Plenipotentiary of Italy announces that he has been authorized by his Court to accept the four Articles; but he understands Count d’Apponyi’s scruples, and believes that it will be better to postpone the acceptance of Article IV., and only to insert it after all the alterations to be made in the Treaty of Paris have been decided on, and when there is no longer occasion to make any others. For his part he would not oppose the addition of the words “of the Black Sea” at the end of Article II., as the explanation of the natural sense of that Article.

The Plenipotentiary of Germany says that he can support this view, adding, however, that he does not think the words “of the Black Sea” necessary, since there can be no doubt as to the sense of the words “non-Riverain Powers,” and that for this reason he will not vote for the addition of the four words unless all the other Plenipotentiaries accept them.

Count d’Apponyi allows that, as to form, the terms of Article IV. are sufficiently general to be applicable at the end of any provision which it may be thought fit to insert. He maintains, however, his reservation as to the acceptance of that Article.

The Plenipotentiary of Russia declares that he has placed before His Majesty the Emperor the Memorandum of the four Articles which had been the result of a friendly consultation between the members of the Conference. It was by the telegraph that he reported them to His Majesty, and the next day he received authority to sign the Protocol of the second sitting, and to agree to the Articles in question.

As to the observations of the Ottoman Ambassador, Baron de Brunnow, while appreciating the feelings by which they have been dictated, requests permission to communicate to the Plenipotentiaries the impression which they have made on him.

He is anxious to state, in the first place, that he entered the Conference in a sincere spirit of conciliation, and with the object of arranging a system of mutual understanding among the Powers. It is with these feelings that he has listened to the words of Musurus Pasha. The principal object of the Emperor's policy being to maintain a real harmony among the Powers, it is very far from his wish to examine closely what might become a motive of distrust and discord between them. For his part, Baron de Brunnow in no way admits an eventuality which he should consider as a great misfortune for Europe, and which would tend to disunite the Great Powers, and, which God forbid, to provoke a conflict between them.

"You know, gentlemen," he says, "that in commanding me to take part in the deliberations of this Conference, the express wish of my august master has been to prevent any controversy which might tend to open the Eastern Question. Devoting myself to the strict fulfilment of the Emperor's intentions, I am resolved to avoid any consideration calculated to recall in this Assembly the memories of the past. The principal object of this Conference is, in my views, to efface those memories. For, according to my inmost convictions, the peace of Europe is never better secured than when the Great Powers, in their relations with one another, know how to make allowance for the feeling of dignity and independence which is deeply rooted in the heart of every nation. It is agreeable to me to be able to affirm, as I do at this moment, that the Plenipotentiaries assembled in this Conference have all been animated by a sincere desire to take into account the national feeling which has pronounced itself strongly in Russia, as regards the expediency of revising in a spirit of equity and concord those of the stipulations of the Treaty of Paris, which, made

under the influence of the then too recent events of the war, are now no longer in harmony with the condition of affairs produced by the state of peace happily re-established in the East.

"According to the instructions with which I am provided, the principal object of the present Conference consists in confirming this state of peace and securing its continuance. I believe myself to be fulfilling this intention by adhering to the arrangement agreed upon between us after the sitting of January 24, and of which the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs has given the substance at the opening of the present meeting.

"My Government has already given its consent to the four Articles mentioned in that arrangement. At the same time, I think it my duty to repeat to the Ambassador of Turkey the assurance that I shall not fail to bring to the knowledge of the Imperial Cabinet the expression of the friendly disposition which he has manifested in the name of His Majesty the Sultan, as regards the relations of good understanding happily established between the two neighbouring Empires. If I may be allowed on my part to add a single hope on this occasion, it is that the system of confidence and harmony established between all the great Powers of Europe may be considered as the best guarantee for the tranquillity, the security, and the prosperity of Turkey."

The Plenipotentiary of Great Britain wishes to state that, after the fortunate result of the first sitting, he placed himself in confidential communication with the other Plenipotentiaries, and found them all animated by a spirit of conciliation, of equity, and impartiality, and desiring to seek the solution of a question—which certainly was not without difficulty—in a manner satisfactory to all the Powers represented in the Conference, and calculated to confirm good feeling and friendly relations, especially between the two Empires of Russia and Turkey.

Earl Granville does not deny that in looking for such a solution he was extremely desirous to follow the initiative of the Sublime Porte. If on this occasion he does not side with the opinion of the Plenipotentiary of Turkey, it is solely because the wording in question seems to him to be more in conformity with the interests of the Ottoman Empire and of all the Powers who have guaranteed its integrity and independence. This solution seems also to him to be that on which it will be easiest to come to an agreement.

He remarks that the Plenipotentiary of Turkey has urged two arguments as regards the wording of Article II.—first,

that it encroaches on the sovereign rights of His Majesty the Sultan; secondly, that it might be interpreted as offensive to Russia. As to the first argument, it is evident that the wording in question would diminish, and that too in a very essential manner, the restrictions at present imposed on the sovereign power of the Sultan as regards the passage of the Straits. As regards the other objection, Earl Granville would deeply regret to believe it to be well founded, it falls of itself as soon as the Plenipotentiary of Russia, in a spirit of conciliation, agrees equally with the other Plenipotentiaries to the above-mentioned Article.

Referring next to the suggestion made by the Plenipotentiary of Austria-Hungary, Lord Granville sees in it no more than a mere question of wording, on which it would be impossible not to be agreed. He is convinced that neither the Ambassador of Russia nor any of the Plenipotentiaries will deny that the idea which they had in discussing the Articles the other day was that the word "Riverain" applies solely to the Powers so designated in the Treaty of Paris.

After an interchange of opinions upon this point it is perfectly understood that the Plenipotentiaries made use of the expression "non-Riverain" in the discussion of January 24 in the same sense which has been attributed to it by Lord Granville.

The Plenipotentiary of Great Britain proposes an Article drawn up as follows, to precede the four Articles in question.—

"The Black Sea remains open, as heretofore, to the mercantile marine of all nations."

This proposal having been accepted, he returns to the wording of Article II. of the Draft, saying that, without wishing to suggest to the Sultan's Government the opinion which it may definitively adopt, he ventures to beg the Plenipotentiary of Turkey to be so good as to bring to the knowledge of his Court the opinions in favour of the original wording of that Article which have been expressed by the Plenipotentiaries of the other Powers, and that he should be glad to hope that His Majesty the Sultan would consent to an arrangement which would diminish in so essential a manner the restrictions at present imposed on the sovereign power of His Majesty over the passage of the Straits.

The Plenipotentiary of Turkey says that he congratulates himself on the fact that Baron de Brunnow appreciates the friendly disposition of His Imperial Majesty the Sultan towards His Majesty the Emperor of Russia. He is very sensible of the declaration of the Plenipotentiary of Great

Britain that he had agreed to the Draft of the four Articles in the interest of Turkey herself. But he thinks that, however sincere may be this friendly solicitude of Great Britain for Turkey, there are in policy certain points of view which are only within the competence of the party most directly interested, and it is in fact for the Sublime Porte to consider and to fore-see the inconvenience which might result from any germ of mistrust and irritation between it and a neighbouring Power.

He would desire to remove from the text of a Treaty any distinction between Powers who have alike guaranteed the integrity and independence of the Ottoman Empire. It is true that the Treaty of Paris contains certain restrictive clauses; but those restrictions being equally applicable to the two Riverain Powers, should not and could not be offensive to Russia.

As to Earl Granville's observation on the argument which represents the wording of Article II. as containing a clause restrictive of the rights of His Majesty the Sultan, the Plenipotentiary of Turkey is anxious to establish this distinction, that before the conclusion of the Treaty of 1856, the Black Sea not being neutralized, the rights of sovereignty of the Sultan were in fact restricted so far as concerns the opening of the Straits to foreign ships of war in time of peace; but that since the neutralization of the Black Sea, the presence of the flag of war of all the Powers having been interdicted in that sea, the closing of the Straits was no longer a restriction derogatory to the rights of sovereignty of the Sublime Porte, but the logical consequence of that interdiction.

He concludes that, in consequence of the neutralization of the Black Sea, there no longer exist any restrictions but those which are common for all the world, and that in return for the great advantages which Turkey derives from that neutralization, the Sublime Porte desires to recover its ancient right to open the Straits in time of peace to the vessels of war of friendly Powers in virtue of the right of territorial sovereignty which it exercises over those Straits. This right belonged to it before the Convention of 1841, and it only exercised it with much circumspection, and in extraordinary and exceptional cases, its interests being opposed to the presence of foreign vessels of war before the capital of the Empire.

As to the observation of the Plenipotentiary of Great Britain on the acceptance by Russia of the original wording of Article II., Musurus Pasha remarks that

the expressions made use of by the Plenipotentiary of Russia do not seem to him to convey an explicit approval of that wording; that, moreover, he does not wish to enter into an examination of the motives for the assent of Russia, and that he merely takes into consideration the effect which such wording might produce on public opinion in different countries.

He begs the Plenipotentiary of Germany to give his opinion on this question, and quotes the words in which that Plenipotentiary had recommended to the Conference in its first sitting the revision of the stipulations of the Treaty of Paris relative to the Black Sea, founding his argument in favour of the revision of these stipulations on their restrictive character, which is calculated to maintain a state of uneasiness between Russia and Turkey.

Count de Bernstorff replies that he has not altered his views on the subject; but that the principal object of his Government has been to contribute in bringing about a general understanding between the Powers who signed the Treaty of Paris of 1856, and that his instructions direct him to make every effort to attain this object.

The Ambassador of Turkey, after having remarked that his instructions were very peremptory as regards the proposed amendment, declares that, deferring to the desire expressed by the other Plenipotentiaries, he will refer the matter to his Court.

Passing to the question of the freedom and navigation of the Danube, the Plenipotentiary of Austria-Hungary remarks that this question was settled by the Treaty of Paris at the same time as that of the neutralization of the Black Sea. He says that this circumstance confirms the close connexion which exists between these two questions, and this it is which has induced the Austro-Hungarian Government to submit to the Conference two proposals, which he recommends the more to their attention as they are intended to facilitate the settlement of two questions equally urgent; one that of the Riverain Commission, the meetings of which have been suspended for a number of years, the other that of the works to be executed at the passage of the "Iron Gates" and of the "Cataracts," and which are imperatively required by the interests of commerce and navigation.

Count d'Apponyi has thought it best to put these two proposals in the form of Articles, intended to modify those in the Treaty of Paris which relate to the question of the Danube.

These Articles would be of the following

tenor, and should necessarily precede Article IV. of the present Draft, which stipulates that all the arrangements of the Treaty of March 30, 1856, which have not been abrogated or modified, preserve their full validity:—

ARTICLE (A).

The conditions of the re-assembling of the Riverain Commission, established by Article XVII. of the Treaty of Paris March 30, 1856, shall be fixed by a previous agreement between the Riverain Powers, and in so far as any modification of Article XVII. of the said Treaty may be involved, by a special Convention between the co-signatory Powers.

ARTICLE (B).

Having regard to the interests of commerce, to the urgency and magnitude of the works necessary to remove the impediments and dangers which interfere with the navigation of the Danube in the passage of the Cataracts and the Iron Gates, His Majesty the Emperor of Austria and King of Hungary will arrange with his co-Riverains of that part of the river as to the technical and financial conditions of an operation designed to remove the above-mentioned impediments by means of works to be undertaken by the Imperial and Royal Government.

The rule established by Article XV. of the Treaty of Paris, to wit, that there shall not be levied any toll founded solely upon the fact of the navigation of the river, is declared inapplicable to the works considered necessary in the above-mentioned part of the river, undertaken by the States possessing the shores of that part of the river at their own expense.

The toll to be levied eventually shall be equal for all flags. Its produce shall only serve to cover the expenses of interest and redemption of the capital employed in the said works, and it shall cease to be levied as soon as the capital shall have been repaid.

The President proposes to substitute for the last sentence of Article (B), beginning with the words, "Its produce," &c., the following amendment:—

"Its amount and the conditions under which it shall be applied shall be arranged and fixed in agreement with the European Powers represented by their delegates. It shall be fixed so as to cover the expenses of interest and redemption of the capital employed in the said works, and so as not to impose on commerce a burden greater than it now bears. It shall cease to be levied as soon as the capital shall have been repaid."

The Plenipotentiary of Italy observes that the toll being established to reimburse the expenses of the works to be executed in the Danube, it ought not to be imposed upon ships which do not pass through the places where the works have been executed, and which would not profit by these same works. He inquires whether it is the intention of the Plenipotentiary who has proposed this Article, and of the Plenipotentiaries who may be disposed to accept it, to establish the toll so that it may not fall on ships which do not pass the parts of the river in which the works shall have been executed.

All the Plenipotentiaries acknowledge the justice of the principle laid down by the Plenipotentiary of Italy.

The Plenipotentiary of Russia stated that the works mentioned in Article (B) are contained in a district placed entirely without the habitual limits of the commercial and industrial activity of Russia, and that, consequently, the Imperial Government cannot undertake any share in the expenses of establishment or the financial guarantees which may result from those works.

This observation met with no objection on the part of the members of the Conference.

The Plenipotentiary of Great Britain proposes that the following Article, having for its object the prolongation of the European Commission of the Danube, shall also be inserted in the Draft of Treaty:—

ARTICLE.

“The Commission established by Article XVI. of the Treaty of Paris, in which the Powers who joined in signing that Treaty are each represented by a Delegate, and which was charged with the designation and execution of the works necessary below Isaktcha, to clear the mouths of the Danube, as well as the neighbouring parts of the Black Sea from the sands and other impediments which obstruct them, in order to put that part of the river and the said parts of the sea in the best state for navigation, is maintained in its present composition; the limits of its competence are extended up to the port of Ibraila, in order to provide for a purely commercial requirement, and without this extension being open to be interpreted as a precedent for future extensions. Its duration is fixed for a further period of twenty-six years, counting from the 24th April, 1871, being the term of the redemption of the loan contracted by that Commission under the guarantee of Germany, Austria, France, Great Britain,

Italy, and Turkey, and of the repayment of the advances made by Turkey to the Commission.”

Lord Granville, in proposing this Article, says that the combination which he would have preferred to any would have been the indefinite prolongation of the European Commission; but that as this opinion met with numerous objections, he confined himself to proposing a prolongation of twenty-six years, a term which he believes to be necessary to finish the great works which remain to be executed at the mouths of the Danube.

The Plenipotentiaries of Germany and Italy declare that they have no instructions as to the extension of the limits of the European Commission to Ibraila, and the Plenipotentiary of Russia joins in this declaration.

As to the duration of the Commission, the Plenipotentiary of Italy says that he is authorized to give his vote for either of the two terms proposed by Lord Granville.

The Plenipotentiary of Germany declares that his instructions would also permit him to vote even for the indefinite prolongation of the term, if all the other Plenipotentiaries were of this opinion, but that since there are some of them who could only accept a prolongation of twelve years, he must confine himself to this latter term.

The Plenipotentiaries of Austria-Hungary and of Russia announce that their instructions direct them not to consent to a longer term than that of twelve years.

The Plenipotentiary of Turkey says that he accepts the principle of the prolongation of the powers of the European Commission of the Danube, but that he has no instructions as to the term of that prolongation. He is equally without instructions as regards the extension of the limits of the European Commission and with regard to the question of the works to be carried out in the Danube. He will request instructions from his Government on these various points.

The President then consents to the insertion of the term of twelve years in the Article in question, and proposes the Article in the shape in which it is reproduced in the Annex, expressing at the same time a hope that at the next meeting the other Plenipotentiaries will find themselves in a position to consent to the prolongation being for twenty-six years, as well as to the extension to Ibraila which has been discussed.

The President adds that he continues to regret greatly the absence of a French

Plenipotentiary, and that he has done all in his power to obtain the co-operation of France. He has made use of the permission which the Conference has been so good as to grant him to inform the *Chargé d'Affaires* of France of all that has passed, as well before as after each of their sittings. He is inclined to hope that the French Government will give its assent subsequently to the decisions of the Conference; and, as regards the prolongation of the European Commission of the Danube, he knows that that Government only a short time ago made no objection to it. He has no reason to believe in any change of views in this respect.

To facilitate the labours of the Plenipotentiaries, the Draft of Treaty which has been under discussion in the present sitting, with the Additional Articles, and the amendments respectively proposed by Earl Granville and Count Apponyi, with the exception of the amendment proposed by Lord Granville at the end of Article (B), is annexed to the present Protocol. Besides the Additional Articles above mentioned, there are two others (IX. and X) relating to the form and ratification of the Treaty, and to the invitation to be addressed to the French Government to accede to it, followed by an "Annex to the Treaty" on the abrogation of the stipulations of the Convention between Russia and the Sublime Porte, relative to the vessels of war of those two Powers in the Black Sea.

It is agreed that when the Articles of the Treaty have received the assent of the Powers represented in the Conference, they shall be signed by the Plenipotentiaries in a Protocol *ad hoc*, to be incorporated subsequently in a formal Treaty, according to the terms of Article IX. of the Draft.

The further discussion of the Articles is deferred to Tuesday, the 7th of February, at one o'clock.

(Signed) BERNSTORFF.
 APPONYI.
 GRANVILLE.
 CADORNA.
 BRUNNOW.
 MUSURUS.

ANNEX.

Draft of Treaty.

ARTICLE I.

The Black Sea remains open, as heretofore, to the mercantile marine of all nations.

ARTICLE II.

The principle of the closing of the Straits of the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles in time of peace, invariably established as the ancient rule of the Ottoman Empire, and confirmed by the Treaty of Paris of March 30, 1856, remains in full force.

ARTICLE III.

His Imperial Majesty the Sultan, by virtue of the right of sovereignty which he exercises over the Straits of the Bosphorus and of the Dardanelles, reserves to himself in time of peace the power of opening them, by way of temporary exception, in case only that the interests of the security of his Empire should cause him to recognize the necessity of the presence of the vessels of war of the non-Riverain Powers of the Black Sea.

ARTICLE IV.

It is agreed that the stipulation contained in the preceding Article shall for the future replace those of Articles XI, XIII., and XIV of the Treaty of Paris of March 30, 1856, as well as the Special Convention concluded between the Sublime Porte and Russia, and annexed to the said Article XIV.

ARTICLE V.

The Commission established by Article XVI. of the Treaty of Paris, in which the Powers who joined in signing that Treaty are each represented by a delegate, and which was charged with the designation and execution of the works necessary below Isaktcha, to clear the mouths of the Danube, as well as the neighbouring parts of the Black Sea from the sands and other impediments which obstruct them, in order to put that part of the river and the said parts of the sea in the best state for navigation, is maintained in its present composition; the limits of its competence are extended up to the port of Ibraila, in order to provide for a purely commercial requirement and without this extension being open to be interpreted as a precedent for future extensions. Its duration is fixed for a further period of twelve years, counting from the 24th of April, 1871, being the term of the redemption of the loan contracted by that Commission, under the guarantee of Germany, Austria, France, Great Britain, Italy, and Turkey.

ARTICLE VI.

The conditions of the re-assembling of the Riverain Commission, established by Article XVII. of the Treaty of Paris of March 30, 1856, shall be fixed by a previous agreement between the Riverain Powers, and, in so far as any modification of Article XVII. of the said Treaty may be involved, by a Special Convention between the co-signatory Powers.

ARTICLE VII.

Having regard to the interests of commerce, to the urgency and magnitude of the works necessary to remove the impediments and dangers which interfere with the navigation of the Danube in the passage of the Cataracts and of the Iron Gates, His Majesty the Emperor of Austria and King of Hungary will arrange with his co-Riverains of that part of the river as to the technical and financial conditions of an operation designed to remove the above mentioned impediments, by means of works to be undertaken by the Imperial and Royal Government.

The rule established by Article XV. of the Treaty of Paris, to wit, that there shall not be levied any toll founded solely upon the fact of the navigation of the river, is declared inapplicable to the works considered necessary in the above-mentioned part of the river, undertaken by the States possessing the shores of that part of the river at their own expense.

The toll to be levied eventually shall be equal for all flags. Its produce shall only serve to cover the expenses of interest and redemption of the capital employed in the said works, and it shall cease to be levied as soon as the capital shall have been repaid.

ARTICLE VIII.

The High Contracting Parties renew and confirm all the stipulations of the Treaty of March 30, 1856, as well as of its Annexes, which are not annulled or modified by the present Treaty.

ARTICLE IX.

The Courts represented by their Plenipotentiaries assembled in Conference in London reserve to themselves to embody the stipulations laid down above in a formal Treaty, the ratifications of which shall be exchanged in London in the space of six weeks after the re-establishment of

peace between Germany and France, or sooner if possible.

ARTICLE X.

It is agreed that the Powers who sign it shall bring the said Treaty to the knowledge of the French Government, with the invitation to accede to it.

ANNEX TO THE TREATY.

Convention concluded between Russia and the Sublime Porte to abrogate the Stipulations of that signed at Paris, March 30, 1856, relative to the Number and Force of the Vessels of War which the Powers possessing the Coasts shall maintain in the Black Sea.

PROTOCOL No. 4.

Sitting of February 7, 1871.

The President inquires of his colleagues whether they are now in a position to pronounce on the Articles of the Draft of Treaty which was discussed in the preceding sitting.

The Austro-Hungarian Plenipotentiary replies that he is authorized to give his assent to the Draft of Articles in its entirety. In case, however, that essential modifications should be introduced into them, he reserves to himself the right of making fresh proposals.

The Plenipotentiary of Russia repeated the assent which he had received orders to give to the four Articles contained in the Memorandum which was drawn up by agreement between the Plenipotentiaries at the conclusion of the sitting of January 21.

As to the Articles relative to the navigation of the Danube, Baron de Brunnow gives his assent to their insertion in the text of the Treaty, so soon as the wording of them has been definitively decided in Conference. But he adds that his instructions authorize him only to agree to the proposal which relates to the prolongation of the European Commission for a space of twelve years.

As regards the proposed extension of the competence of the Commission as far as the Port of Ibraila, Baron de Brunnow stated that he possessed no instructions on this point, and that before expressing an opinion on the merits of this project, he must reserve to himself the time necessary to request the orders of his Court.

The Ottoman Plenipotentiary says that he is still awaiting the instructions of his Court before being able to pronounce himself on the Articles of the Draft.

The Plenipotentiary of Italy says he is authorized to support the proposed extension of the competence of the European Commission as far as Ibraila; and he confirms the assent he had already given to the Articles of the Draft of Treaty.

The Plenipotentiary of Germany declares himself ready to adhere to the whole of the Draft of Treaty, provided always that all the other Members of the Conference decide on accepting it.

After having initialled the draft of Protocol of the preceding sitting, the Plenipotentiaries separate, begging the President to be so good as to fix the day of their next meeting, as soon as they have been provided with the instructions which they expect from their Courts.

(Signed) BERNSTORFF.
 APPONYI.
 GRANVILLE.
 CADORNA.
 BRUNNOW.
 MUSURUS.

(Translation.)

PROTOCOL No. 5.

Sitting of March 13, 1871.

At the commencement of the sitting the President presents the Duc de Broglie to the Conference as Plenipotentiary of France, saying,—

“I believe that I represent correctly the feelings of the Plenipotentiaries in expressing to the Duc de Broglie the warm satisfaction with which we welcome here to-day the Representative of France.

“I hope that the Duke will have been able to convince himself from the successive adjournments of our sittings, from the Protocols we have signed, and from the communications which the Plenipotentiaries have allowed me to make almost daily to the Chargé d’Affaires of France, that we have done all in our power to secure the indispensable concurrence of France.”

The Plenipotentiary of France, after having presented his full powers, which are found to be in good and due form, replies to Earl Granville in the following terms:—

“I thank the President of the Conference sincerely in the name of the French Government for the expressions of friendship and goodwill towards France which he has just made use of; I offer the same thanks to the Plenipotentiaries who are so good as to join in those expressions. I ought, at the same time, to apologize to them for having delayed so long to take my seat among them, and for having so far abused their patience; but the whole

world knows the painful causes which detained the Representative of France.

“Although regularly informed by your kind communications of the progress of your deliberations, the French Government has not been able to take part in them, and they are now almost come to a conclusion. The principal object which led to the assembly of this Conference has been settled by general agreement between the Representatives present. The French Government would, perhaps, have preferred to abstain to the last from joining in decisions in the discussion of which it has taken no part.

“But it would have feared that, by continuing its abstention now that the sad cause of it has disappeared, it might have failed to give sufficient evidence of the value which it attaches to all that can maintain or re-establish harmony between the Great Powers. It therefore avails itself eagerly of the opportunity to maintain the salutary rule of the European family of nations,—namely, that no essential change should be introduced into the relations of nations towards one another without the examination and consent of all the Great Powers,—a practice which protects and affords a true guarantee for peace and civilization, and which has been too often disregarded in these last years.

“As regards the principal object of the Conference, the French Government, sharing the feelings expressed by the Plenipotentiary of Turkey, would not personally have seen any sufficient reason to modify the stipulations established by the Treaty of 1856, and would have preferred their maintenance. But, at the stage at which affairs have arrived, and from the moment that the new arrangement, agreeable to the Russian Government, is agreed to by that of the Sublime Porte, the Party principally interested in the question, the French Government willingly enters into the feeling of conciliation which has dictated it, and gives its assent to all the decisions of the Conference.”

The Plenipotentiary of Russia hastens to offer to the Ambassador of France the expression of his sincere thanks for the friendly feelings which he has been so good as to express with regard to Russia; he will make it his duty to report them to his Court, and he adds that the spirit of conciliation which has guided the decisions of the French Government as regards the question submitted to the deliberations of the Conference will be warmly appreciated by the Cabinet of St. Petersburg.

On the invitation of the President, the Plenipotentiary of France attaches his signature to the Protocol annexed to that of the sitting of January 17.

The Protocol of the fourth sitting having been read and approved, the President reads, Article by Article, the Draft of Treaty as contained in Annex to the Protocol (No. 3) of the sitting of February 3.

On Article I. being read, it is decided that this Article shall become Article III. of the Treaty, and Article I. shall be thus worded :—

“ARTICLE I.

“Articles XI., XIII., and XIV. of the Treaty of Paris of March 30, 1856, as well as the Special Convention concluded between the Sublime Porte and Russia, and annexed to the said Article XIV., are abrogated, and replaced by the following Article.”

Lord Granville having read Articles II. and III. of the Draft, the Plenipotentiary of Turkey announces to the Conference that he has received the reply of his Government as to the wording of these two Articles. The Sublime Porte very much regrets to find itself differing in opinion from the majority of the members of the Conference as to the words “non-Riverain Powers.” The Council of Ministers, to which this wording has a second time been submitted, continues to consider that these words imply a serious restriction. However, in order not to impede or delay the work of conciliation which the Conference has undertaken, he has been authorized by the Sublime Porte to declare that it will be content to preserve intact the Convention of March 30, 1856, relative to the Straits of the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus.

The Plenipotentiary of Austria-Hungary declares that he is not authorized by his Court to accept the *status quo*. He believes, however, that there are amendments to be proposed to which it will be possible for him to assent.

The Plenipotentiary of France would have preferred the original wording, to which Russia, as well as the majority of the other Powers represented in the Conference, had adhered.

The Plenipotentiary of Italy remarks that he had joined with the other Plenipotentiaries in accepting Articles II. and III. of the Draft, which would have been preferred by his Government. His Government, not being disposed to accept the modifications in these Articles which had been proposed by the Plenipotentiary of Turkey, has thought it right to provide for the event of the Sublime Porte not accepting the two Articles of the Draft. It has therefore arranged in this event to make a proposal which, by its concilia-

tory character, might secure the assent of all the Powers represented in the Conference. He expresses the hope of his Government that the Conference will appreciate the spirit and object of this proposal. In consequence of the declarations which have been made to the Conference, he proposes, in the name of his Government, to substitute for Articles II. and III. of the Draft of Treaty an Article thus worded —

“ARTICLE II.

“The principle of the closing of the Straits of the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus, such as it has been established by the Separate Treaty of March 30, 1856, is maintained, with power to His Imperial Majesty the Sultan to open the said Straits in time of peace to the fleets of the friendly and allied Powers, in the event that the execution of the stipulations of the Treaty of Paris of March 30, 1856, should require it.”

The Ottoman Plenipotentiary declares that the wording proposed by the Plenipotentiary of Italy being in conformity with the spirit of his previous instructions, he considers himself authorized to agree to it in the name of the Sublime Porte. He proposes merely to replace the word “Treaty” by that of “Convention,” the word “fleets” by the words “vessels of war,” and to word as follows the concluding phrase of this Article. “In the event that the Sublime Porte should consider it necessary, in order to secure the execution of the stipulations of the Treaty of Paris of March 30, 1856.”

The Plenipotentiary of Austria-Hungary says that he is authorized to accept the proposal of the Plenipotentiary of Italy. As to the modifications proposed by the Plenipotentiary of Turkey, being of opinion that they do not alter the sense of the Article, he would be inclined to accept them in case they should be adopted by the other members of the Conference.

The Plenipotentiaries of Germany, of France, of Great Britain, and of Russia, declare themselves also to be authorized to accept the proposal as it has been made by the Plenipotentiary of Italy; and, as regards the amendments proposed by the Plenipotentiary of Turkey, they adhere also to the declaration made by the Plenipotentiary of Austria-Hungary.

The Plenipotentiary of Italy remarks that the Conference has always manifested its inclination to defer to the wishes of the Sublime Porte as the Power most directly interested in the object of the Conference, and that Italy had concurred

in this course. After the declarations of the other Plenipotentiaries with regard to the amendments to the Italian proposal brought forward by the Plenipotentiary of Turkey, he declares, though being without special instructions on this subject, that he believes himself to be sufficiently authorized to join in the opinion expressed by the other Plenipotentiaries.

The Plenipotentiary of Turkey says that his Government will not fail to appreciate the spirit of conciliation of which the Italian Government has given proof, and he expresses to M. le Chevalier Cadorna his gratitude on this account.

Article II, as proposed by the Plenipotentiary of Italy, with the modifications made in it by Musurus Pasha, is then adopted by the Conference.

The provisions contained in Article IV. of the Draft of Treaty have already been inserted in Article I.

After reading Article V. of the Draft of Treaty, the President inquires of the Plenipotentiary of France the opinion of his Government on the question of the prolongation of the powers of the European Commission of the Danube. He believes that all the Powers admit the necessity of a prolongation. For himself he would have preferred that it should have been of longer duration, but since there is a difference of opinion on this point, he is ready to accept the term of twelve years mentioned in the Article which he has just read.

The Duc de Broglie replies that the French Government would have consented to the longer term which Earl Granville had at first proposed, but that, failing that, it will accept the more limited term of twelve years.

The Plenipotentiary of Austria-Hungary, although it was his Government which originally proposed the term of twelve years, would have consented to accept a prolongation of twenty-six years in deference to the wishes of the British Government, if the other members of the Conference had consented to it.

The Ottoman Plenipotentiary accepts the prolongation of twelve years, while declaring that he would have consented to a longer term.

The Plenipotentiary of Russia says that his Government had consented to the term of twelve years under the supposition that it was the term which the Austro-Hungarian Government had in view, and that he has not received authority to accept a more distant term.

The Plenipotentiary of Italy would have consented to the longest term possible.

The Plenipotentiary of Germany is

limited by his instructions to the term of twelve years, according to the original proposal of the Austro-Hungarian Government.

At the close of this discussion, the term of twelve years is adopted by the Conference.

As to the projected extension of the competence of the Commission as far as Ibraila, the Plenipotentiary of Russia says that his Government has recognized the expediency of not prejudicing the intentions of the Sublime Porte on this point.

Musurus Pasha replies that the Sublime Porte regrets not to be able to assent to the extension of the competence of the European Commission, for the same reasons which prevented it from accepting this same proposal when it was made at the Conferences of Paris of 1866.

The Plenipotentiary of France declares that his Government would have consented to the extension, as it had already done at the time of the Conferences of 1866, but that it feels itself compelled to abandon it in consequence of the opposition of Turkey.

The Plenipotentiary of Germany sides with Turkey, whose interests are more directly affected by this question than those of any other Power.

The Plenipotentiary of Italy would have consented to the extension, and would even have desired it, if the other Plenipotentiaries had accepted it.

The Plenipotentiary of Austria-Hungary explains that his Government had not desired the extension, but that since the proposal had been made with a purely commercial object, it would have acceded to it if the other Powers were agreed in accepting it.

The Plenipotentiary of Great Britain believes that the proposed extension would be of great advantage to commerce; but since Turkey is opposed to it, he will not insist on this point.

The extension of the competence of the Commission having thus been dropped, Article V. of the Draft, now become Article IV, runs as follows:—

ARTICLE IV.

The Commission established by Article XVI. of the Treaty of Paris, in which the Powers who joined in signing the Treaty are each represented by a delegate, and which was charged with the designation and execution of the works necessary below Isakcha, to clear the mouths of the Danube, as well as the neighbouring parts of the Black Sea, from the sands

and other impediments which obstruct them, in order to put that part of the river and the said parts of the sea in the best state for navigation, is maintained in its present composition. The duration of that Commission is fixed for a further period of twelve years, counting from April 24, 1871, that is to say, till April 24, 1883, being the term of the redemption of the loan contracted by that Commission, under the guarantee of Germany, Austria-Hungary, France, Great Britain, Italy, and Turkey.

After Article VI. of the Draft of Treaty, now become Article V in consequence of the alterations made in the other Articles, has been read, the Plenipotentiary of Turkey announces that he has come to an understanding with the other Representatives of the co-Riverain Powers on the subject of an amendment to be proposed to it.

The amendment in question having been agreed to by the Conference, Article V. is thus worded :—

ARTICLE V.

The conditions of the re-assembling of the Riverain Commission, established by Article XVII. of the Treaty of Paris of March 30, 1856, shall be fixed by a previous understanding between the Riverain Powers, without prejudice to the clause relative to the three Danubian Principalities; and in so far as any modification of Article XVII. of the said Treaty may be involved, this latter shall form the subject of a special Convention between the co-signatory Powers.

Referring next to Article VII. of the Draft of Treaty, now become Article VI., Musurus Pasha announces that he has also come to an understanding with his co-Riverain colleagues as to a new form to be given to that Article. The wording which he proposes, and which is adopted by the Conference, is as follows :—

ARTICLE VI.

The Powers possessing the shores of that part of the Danube where the Cataracts and the Iron Gates offer impediments to navigation reserving to themselves to come to an understanding with the view of removing those impediments, the High Contracting Parties recognize from the present moment their right to levy a provisional tax on vessels of commerce of every flag which may henceforth benefit thereby, until the extinction of the debt contracted for the execution of the works; and they declare Article XV. of the Treaty of Paris of 1856

to be inapplicable to that part of the river for a lapse of time necessary for the repayment of the debt in question.

The following Article, having for its object to protect effectually the works and establishments, as well as the staff, of the European Commission of the Danube, is then proposed by the Plenipotentiary of Austria-Hungary and adopted by the Conference :—

ARTICLE VII.

All the works and establishments of every kind created by the European Commission in execution of the Treaty of Paris of 1856, or of the present Treaty, shall continue to enjoy the same neutrality which has hitherto protected them, and which shall be equally respected for the future, under all circumstances, by the High Contracting Parties. The benefits of the immunities which result therefrom shall extend to the whole administrative and engineering staff of the Commission. It is, however, well understood that the provisions of this Article shall in no way affect the right of the Sublime Porte to send, as heretofore, its vessels of war into the Danube in its character of territorial Power.

Article VIII. of the Draft is adopted verbatim as Article VIII. of the Treaty.

In consequence of the arrival of the Plenipotentiary of France, Articles IX. and X. of the Draft of Treaty are suppressed and replaced by the following formal Article :—

ARTICLE IX.

The present Treaty shall be ratified, and the ratifications shall be exchanged in the space of six weeks, or sooner if possible.

The Articles of the Treaty having thus been decided on, the Plenipotentiaries of Russia and Turkey announce that they have received authority from their respective Courts to conclude a Convention to abrogate the stipulations of that signed at Paris on the 13th March, 1856, relative to the number and force of the vessels of war of the Riverain Powers in the Black Sea. They propose to communicate this Convention to the Conference, and to exchange the ratifications of it on the same day as those of the Treaty, so that mention may be made thereof in the same Certificate of Exchange.

The other Plenipotentiaries, being of opinion that a Convention concluded and ratified in the manner mentioned will have the same force and validity as if it were annexed to the Treaty, give their

full assent to the proposal of their two colleagues.

A copy of the Treaty (that of Great Britain) having been prepared during the sitting, is brought in; and after having been read and found in due form, is signed by the Plenipotentiaries, who at the same time affix to it the seals of their arms.

It is agreed that the Conference shall meet to-morrow at half-past 3 o'clock for the signature of the other copies of the Treaty.

(Signed) BERNSTORFF.
APPONYI.
BROGLIE.
GRANVILLE.
CADORNA.
BRUNNOW.
MUSTERS.

PROTOCOL No 6.

Sitting of March 14, 1871.

The Protocol of the fifth sitting is read and approved. The various copies of the Treaty having been compared with that which was signed at the preceding sitting, and having been found in due form, the Plenipotentiaries proceeded to affix their signatures and the seals of their arms to them.

The Conference decides that the exchange of the ratifications of the Treaty shall take place in six copies.

At the end of the Conference, Musurus

Pasha, speaking in the name of the Members of the Conference, proposes to express to Earl Granville the thanks and feelings of gratitude of all the Plenipotentiaries for the enlightened and courteous manner in which, in his capacity as President, he has directed the labours of the Conference, and for the spirit of conciliation of which he has secured the prevalence during the whole course of its deliberations.

All the Plenipotentiaries readily and unanimously accept this proposal, and decide that it shall be recorded in the Protocol of the sitting.

Earl Granville expresses his deep gratitude to the Plenipotentiaries for the friendly expressions which have been addressed to him in their name by the Ottoman Ambassador. On his part he is anxious to state how much he appreciates the conciliatory spirit by which all his colleagues in the Conference have been animated since the commencement of their sittings, and how sensible he is of the consideration and indulgence which has always been shown to him.

The present Protocol is read and approved.

(Signed) BERNSTORFF.
APPONYI.
BROGLIE.
GRANVILLE.
CADORNA.
BRUNNOW.
MUSTERS.

IX.

FRANCE AND THE CONFERENCE.

M. JULES FAVRE, French Minister of Foreign Affairs, addressed the following circular to the French Diplomatic Agents abroad:—

“Paris, January 12, 1871.

“Sir,—The Government has hitherto felt it right to maintain a strict reserve in respect of the negotiations which have been set on foot for a revision of the Treaties of 1856. That such revision, should it be necessary, belongs exclusively to the Powers which were signatories of those Treaties is a truth so evident that it is needless to dwell upon it. There can be no doubt upon the point. Thus, when one of those Powers demanded a modification of the Conventions which were equally binding upon all the signatories,

the idea of a Conference, at which the question could be discussed, was adopted without difficulty. The place of France in that Conference was marked out. But could she think of occupying it at a moment when she was entirely absorbed by the defence of her territory? Such was the grave question which the Government has had to consider under the circumstances which I am about briefly to recount. It was by a despatch, dated Tours, 11th of November, received in Paris on the 17th, that the Minister for Foreign Affairs was informed by M. de Chaudordy, of Prince Gortschakoff's Circular. This intelligence was communicated to him by a telegram from our Minister at Vienna in the following terms:—‘The Russian Minister yester-

day made a communication from which it appears that his Government considers itself as no longer bound by the stipulations of the Treaties of 1856.' On the same day, November 17th, the Minister of Foreign Affairs replied to M. de Chaudordy, recommending the strictest reserve. We had up to that time received no official communication, and we were bound to confine ourselves to a policy of observation, at the same time without omitting to maintain on all occasions our formal right to take part in a resolution which, without our participation, would be absolutely devoid of value. Europe could not entertain any other view, and in the conversations and notes which have been interchanged between the various Powers and ourselves it has always been understood that France was a necessary party to the deliberation, and that she would be invited to join in it. I should hold myself guilty of an unpardonable indiscretion if I were now to reveal the details of these *pourparlers*. Our effort has been to take advantage of the friendly dispositions which have been manifested towards us, and to bring the representatives of the Powers to acknowledge that, without deserting or in any way detracting from the extreme importance which the discussion of the Treaties of 1856 would have for us, yet we were bound upon entering the Conference to introduce yet another discussion of a most important character which should not be met by a plea of incompetency. However, it must be admitted that while fully sharing this view the Delegation at Tours has always been of opinion that we should accept the invitation of Europe if it should be addressed to us. Summing up this opinion, M. de Chaudordy wrote on his despatch of the 10th of December, 'The Delegation is of opinion, after having examined with me all the despatches, that we should join the Conference, even without a previous promise or a subsequent armistice.' The opinion of the members of the Delegation has never changed. M. Gambetta strongly expresses it in his last despatch from the 31st of December, 1870, to the 3rd of January, 1871. Addressing the Minister of Foreign Affairs he writes, 'You must be on the point of quitting Paris to repair to the Conference at London, if as I am assured England has succeeded in obtaining a safe conduct for you. I can imagine the pangs which you will experience in leaving Paris and our colleagues. I can hear the expression of your grief and your early refusals, and yet I must tell you in the interest of our cause it must be so.' Before M. Gambetta had written these lines the Minister

of Foreign Affairs, following as well as the imperfection and the delays in communication allowed him to do the negotiations entered upon at Tours, and continued afterwards at Bordeaux, had intimated to M. de Chaudordy that the Government had decided that if regularly invited France would send a representative to the Conference at London, but with the condition that England, which had sent it a verbal invitation, would undertake to obtain the necessary safe conduct for its representative if he were selected in Paris. This arrangement was accepted by the English Cabinet. M. de Chaudordy informed the Minister of Foreign Affairs of it in a despatch, dated Bordeaux, December 26th, 1870, received on the 8th of January. He informed him at the same time that the Delegation of the Government had selected him as the fitting representative of France at the Conference. This communication was confirmed by the following letter written by Lord Granville on the 29th of December, and transmitted to us on the 10th of the present month through the medium of the United States' Minister:—

“‘**LORD GRANVILLE TO HIS EXCELLENCY THE MINISTER FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS AT PARIS.**

“‘*London, December 29, 1870.*

“‘*Monsieur le Ministre,—M. de Chaudordy has informed Lord Lyons that your Excellency was proposed to represent France at the Conference which it has been agreed to hold in London, concerning the Neutralization of the Black Sea, and he has at the same time requested me to obtain a safe conduct which will enable your Excellency to pass through the Prussian lines. I immediately requested Count Bernstorff to apply for the safe conduct, and to transmit it to your Excellency by a German officer despatched with a flag of truce. M. de Bernstorff yesterday informed me that a safe conduct would be placed at your Excellency's disposition whenever it should be applied for by an officer sent from Paris to the German head-quarters, seeing that satisfaction had not been given for the officer bearing a flag of truce upon whom the French had fired. I have been informed by M. Tissot that much time would elapse before this information could be transmitted to you by the Delegation at Bordeaux, and I have consequently suggested to Count Bernstorff another means by which it could reach you, by taking advantage of the opportunity offered by the *chargé d'affaires* of the United States to acquaint*

you with what has passed. It had been agreed that the Conference shall assemble this week, but in order to afford time for the arrival of the French Plenipotentiary, the day of meeting has been fixed for the 3rd of January. I trust that your Excellency will authorize M. Tissot to represent you at the first meeting, at which I will place upon the order of the day only questions of form, and, if your Excellency is in a position to inform me of your arrival, I would propose to adjourn the Conference for a week to obtain the valuable advantage of your experience. I trust that your Excellency will permit me to take the opportunity of expressing my gratification at entering upon personal relations with yourself, and the pleasure I shall have in seeing you in London.

"I have the honour, &c.,

"GRANVILLE."

"Being called upon by the despatch, the Government could not, without abdicating the rights of France, reject the invitation which it received in her name. Undoubtedly it might be objected that, for France, the moment is not favourable for a discussion respecting the neutrality of the Black Sea. But it is precisely because at this supreme moment France is fighting for her honour and her existence that the official proposition made to the French Republic by the European Cabinets acquires an exceptional importance. It is a tardy commencement of justice, an engagement which cannot be retracted. It consecrates with the authority of public law the change of reign, and brings upon the scene where the destinies of the world are being contested the free nation, free despite her wounds, in place of the chief who led her to her danger or of the pretenders who sought to dispose of her. Besides, who does not feel that, admitted to face the representatives of Europe, France has an incontestable right to lift up her voice? Who can arrest her when, relying upon the eternal rules of justice, she will defend the principles which guarantee her independence and her dignity? She will abandon none which we have maintained. Our programme is unchanged, and Europe, who invites those who framed it, knows well that they are bound and are prepared to maintain it. There was no room, therefore, for hesitation, and the Government would have committed a grave fault in rejecting the overture which was made to it. But while recognizing that fact, it thought, with myself, that the Minister for Foreign Affairs could not, without some reason of paramount importance, quit Paris in the midst of a bombardment which the enemy

is directing upon our city. For a week past, suddenly, without warning to the inoffensive inhabitants and neutrals, the Commander-in-Chief of the Prussian Army showers his murderous projectiles upon our buildings. It seems that he selects in preference our hospitals, our schools, our churches, our benevolent institutions. Women are killed in their beds, children in the arms of their parents or under the eyes of their teachers. Yesterday we accompanied to their last resting places five little coffins of young pupils crushed under the weight of a shell weighing 200lbs. The church, where their remains were blest by the priest and watered by the tears of their parents, testified by its walls, shattered even at night, to the fury of the assailants. I know not how long these inhuman measures will continue. Useless for the attack, they are only an act of depredation and murder destined to excite terror. Our brave population of Paris feels its courage increase with the danger. Firm, irritated, resolute, it is indignant and does not bend. It means more than ever to fight and conquer, and we mean it also. I cannot think of separating myself from it at this crisis. Perhaps our protests addressed to Europe, the protest of the Ambassadors present in Paris, will soon put an end to it. Till then England will understand that my place is in the midst of my fellow-citizens. This is what I explained to the Foreign Minister of Great Britain in the reply which is subjoined, and which fitly closes this statement:—

"Paris, Jan. 10.

"M. le Comte,—I received only today, the 10th of January, at nine p.m., through the Minister of the United States, the letter which your Excellency has done me the honour of writing to me, dated the 20th of December, 1870, whereby I am informed that you have requested Count Bernstorff to place at my disposal the safe conduct necessary for my passing through the Prussian lines and attending, as representative of France, the Conference which is to be opened at London. I thank your Excellency for this communication, and for the kindness shown me in facilitating the accomplishment of the duty imposed on me. It is, however, difficult for me, to depart immediately from Paris, which for eight days has been given up to the horrors of a bombardment carried on against its inoffensive population, without the warning which is usual according to the law of nations. I do not feel it right to abandon my fellow-citizens at the moment

when they are victims of this violence. Moreover, the communications between Paris and London are by the act of the Commander-in-Chief of the besieging army so slow and uncertain that I cannot, notwithstanding my good wishes, reply to your appeal in the terms of your despatch. You kindly informed me that the Conference would meet on the 3rd of January, and would then probably adjourn for a week. Apprised of this on the evening of the 10th, I could not profit by your invitation in proper time. Moreover, Count Bismarck, while allowing the letter to reach me, has not accompanied it with a safe conduct, which is, however, indispensable. He requests that a French officer should repair to the Prussian Head-Quarters to seek the safe conduct, availing himself of complaints which he addressed to the Governor of Paris on the occasion of an incident complained of by a *parlementaire* on the 23rd of December, and Count Bismarck adds that, until satisfaction has been given him, the Prussian Commander-in-Chief forbids any communication by *parlementaires*. I do not inquire whether such a resolution, contrary to the laws of war, would not be the absolute negation of superior rights which necessity and humanity have always maintained for the benefit of belligerents. I content myself with remarking to your Excellency that the Governor of Paris promptly ordered an inquiry into the fact cited by Count Bismarck, and in announcing this to him brought to his knowledge

facts of the same kind, much more numerous, imputable to Prussian sentinels, on which facts, however, he had never thought of relying for the purpose of interrupting the exchange of ordinary relations. Count Bismarck seems to have admitted, at least partially, the justice of these observations, for this very day he charged the United States' Ambassador to inform me that, receiving respective inquiries, he re-establishes relations by *parlementaires*. There is no necessity, then, for a French officer to repair to the Prussian Head-Quarters, and I am about to enter into communication with the United States' Ambassador in order to procure the safe conduct which you have kindly obtained. As soon as I have this document in my hands and the situation of Paris permits, I shall proceed to London, sure beforehand of not invoking in vain in the name of my Government the principles of right and morality which Europe has so great an interest in causing to be respected.

“Accept, &c.,

“JULES FAYRE.”

“I beg you, Sir, to bring this despatch to the knowledge of the Government to which you are accredited. It is fit that Europe should be enlightened on our intentions and our acts; it is to its equity that we submit them

“Accept, &c.,

“The Minister of Foreign Affairs,

“JULES FAYRE.”

X.

THE TREATY OF WASHINGTON.

(Signed at Washington, the 8th May, 1871.)

HER Britannic Majesty and the United States of America, being desirous to provide for an amicable settlement of all causes of difference between the two countries, have for that purpose appointed their respective Plenipotentiaries,—that is to say, Her Britannic Majesty on her part has appointed as her High Commissioners and Plenipotentiaries the Right Hon. George Frederick Samuel, Earl de Grey and Earl of Ripon, Viscount Goderich, Baron Grantham, a Baronet, a Peer of the United Kingdom, Lord President of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, Knight of the Most Noble Order of the Garter, &c.; the Right Hon. Sir Stafford Henry Northcote, Baronet, one of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council,

a Member of Parliament, a Companion of the Most Honourable Order of the Bath, &c.; Sir Edward Thornton, Knight Commander of the Most Honourable Order of the Bath, Her Majesty's Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the United States of America; Sir John Alexander Macdonald, Knight Commander of the Most Honourable Order of the Bath, a Member of Her Majesty's Privy Council for Canada, and Minister of Justice and Attorney-General of Her Majesty's Dominion of Canada; and Montague Bernard, Esq., Chichele Professor of International Law in the University of Oxford; and the President of the United States has appointed on the part of the United States as Commissioners in a Joint

High Commission and Plenipotentiaries, Hamilton Fish, Secretary of State; Robert Cumming Schenck, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Great Britain, Samuel Nelson, an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States; Ebenezer Rockwood Hoar, of Massachusetts; and George Henry Williams, of Oregon. And the said Plenipotentiaries, after having exchanged their full powers, which were found to be in due and proper form, have agreed to and concluded the following Articles.—

ARTICLE I.

Whereas differences have arisen between the Government of the United States and the Government of Her Britannic Majesty, and still exist, growing out of the acts committed by the several vessels which have given rise to the claims generically known as the Alabama claims. And whereas Her Britannic Majesty has authorized her High Commissioners and Plenipotentiaries to express in a friendly spirit the regret felt by Her Majesty's Government for the escape, under whatever circumstances, of the Alabama and other vessels from British ports, and for the depredations committed by those vessels. Now, in order to remove and adjust all complaints and claims on the part of the United States, and to provide for the speedy settlement of such claims, which are not admitted by Her Britannic Majesty's Government, the High Contracting Parties agree that all the said claims growing out of acts committed by the aforesaid vessels, and generically known as the Alabama claims, shall be referred to a Tribunal of Arbitration, to be composed of five Arbitrators, to be appointed in the following manner—that is to say, one shall be named by Her Britannic Majesty; one shall be named by the President of the United States; His Majesty the King of Italy shall be requested to name one; the President of the Swiss Confederation shall be requested to name one; and His Majesty the Emperor of Brazil shall be requested to name one. In case of the death, absence, or incapacity to serve of any or either of the said Arbitrators, or in the event of either of the said Arbitrators omitting or declining or ceasing to act as such, Her Britannic Majesty, or the President of the United States, or His Majesty the King of Italy, or the President of the Swiss Confederation, or His Majesty the Emperor of Brazil, as the case may be, may forthwith name another person to act as Arbitrator in the place and stead of the Arbitrator originally named by such

head of a State. And in the event of the refusal or omission for two months after receipt of the request from either of the High Contracting Parties of His Majesty the King of Italy, or the President of the Swiss Confederation, or His Majesty the Emperor of Brazil, to name an Arbitrator either to fill the original appointment or in the place of one who may have died, be absent, or incapacitated, or who may omit, decline, or from any cause cease to act as such Arbitrator, His Majesty the King of Sweden and Norway shall be requested to name one or more persons, as the case may be, to act as such Arbitrator or Arbitrators.

ARTICLE II.

The Arbitrators shall meet at Geneva, in Switzerland, at the earliest convenient day after they shall have been named, and shall proceed impartially and carefully to examine and decide all questions that shall be laid before them on the part of the Governments of Her Britannic Majesty and the United States respectively. All questions considered by the tribunal, including the final award, shall be decided by a majority of all the Arbitrators. Each of the High Contracting Parties shall also name one person to attend the tribunal as its agent to represent it generally in all matters connected with the arbitration.

ARTICLE III.

The written or printed case of each of the two parties, accompanied by the documents, the official correspondence, and other evidence on which each relies, shall be delivered in duplicate to each of the Arbitrators, and to the agent of the other party, as soon as may be after the organization of the tribunal, but within a period not exceeding six months from the date of the exchange of the ratifications of this Treaty.

ARTICLE IV.

Within four months after the delivery on both sides of the written or printed case, either party may, in like manner, deliver in duplicate to each of the said Arbitrators, and to the agent of the other party, a counter case and additional documents, correspondence, and evidence in reply to the case, documents, correspondence, and evidence so presented by the other party. The Arbitrators may, however, extend the time for delivering such counter case, documents, correspondence, and evidence when, in their

judgment, it becomes necessary in consequence of the distance of the place from which the evidence to be presented is to be procured. If in the case submitted to the Arbitrators either party shall have specified or alluded to any report or document in its own exclusive possession without annexing a copy, such party shall be bound, if the other party thinks proper to apply for it, to furnish that party with a copy thereof; and either party may call upon the other, through the Arbitrators, to produce the originals or certified copies of any papers adduced as evidence, giving in each instance such reasonable notice as the Arbitrators may require.

ARTICLE V.

It shall be the duty of the agent of each party, within two months after the expiration of the time limited for the delivery of the counter case on both sides, to deliver in duplicate to each of the said Arbitrators and to the agent of the other party a written or printed argument showing the points and referring to the evidence upon which his Government relies; and the Arbitrators may, if they desire further elucidation with regard to any point, require a written or printed statement or argument or oral argument by counsel upon it; but in such case the other party shall be entitled to reply either orally or in writing, as the case may be.

ARTICLE VI.

In deciding the matters submitted to the Arbitrators they shall be governed by the following three rules, which are agreed upon by the High Contracting Parties as rules to be taken as applicable to the case, and by such principles of international law not inconsistent therewith as the Arbitrators shall determine to have been applicable to the case.—Rules.—A neutral Government is bound—First.—To use due diligence to prevent the fitting out, arming, or equipping, within its jurisdiction, of any vessel which it has reasonable ground to believe is intended to cruise or to carry on war against a Power with which it is at peace; and also to use like diligence to prevent the departure from its jurisdiction of any vessel intended to cruise or carry on war as above, such vessel having been specially adapted, in whole or in part, within such jurisdiction, to warlike use. Secondly.—Not to permit or suffer either belligerent to make use of its ports or waters as the base of naval operations against the other, or for the purpose of the renewal or augmentation of military supplies or arms, or the re-

cruitment of men. Thirdly.—To exercise due diligence in its own ports and waters, and, as to all persons within its jurisdiction, to prevent any violation of the foregoing obligations and duties. Her Britannic Majesty has commanded her High Commissioners and Plenipotentiaries to declare that Her Majesty's Government cannot assent to the foregoing rules as a statement of principles of international law which were in force at the time when the claims mentioned in Article I. arose; but that Her Majesty's Government, in order to evince its desire of strengthening the friendly relations between the two countries and of making satisfactory provision for the future, agrees that, in deciding the questions between the two countries arising out of those claims, the Arbitrators should assume that Her Majesty's Government had undertaken to act upon the principles set forth in these rules. And the High Contracting Parties agree to observe these rules as between themselves in future, and to bring them to the knowledge of other maritime Powers and to invite them to accede to them.

ARTICLE VII.

The decision of the tribunal shall, if possible, be made within three months from the close of the argument on both sides. It shall be made in writing and dated, and shall be signed by the Arbitrators who may assent to it. The said tribunal shall first determine as to each vessel separately whether Great Britain has, by any act or omission, failed to fulfil any of the duties set forth in the foregoing three rules, or recognized by the principles of international law not inconsistent with such rules, and shall certify such fact as to each of the said vessels. In case the tribunal find that Great Britain has failed to fulfil any duty or duties as aforesaid, it may, if it think proper, proceed to award a sum in gross to be paid by Great Britain to the United States for all the claims referred to it; and in such case the gross sum so awarded shall be paid in coin by the Government of Great Britain to the Government of the United States at Washington within twelve months after the date of the award. The award shall be in duplicate, one copy whereof shall be delivered to the agent of Great Britain for his Government, and the other copy shall be delivered to the agent of the United States for his Government.

ARTICLE VIII.

Each Government shall pay its own

agent and provide for the proper remuneration of the counsel employed by it, and of the Arbitrator appointed by it, and for the expense of preparing and submitting its case to the tribunal. All other expenses connected with the arbitration shall be defrayed by the two Governments in equal moieties.

ARTICLE IX.

The Arbitrators shall keep an accurate record of their proceedings, and may appoint and employ the necessary officers to assist them.

ARTICLE X.

In case the tribunal finds that Great Britain has failed to fulfil any duty or duties as aforesaid, and does not award a sum in gross, the high contracting parties agree that a Board of Assessors shall be appointed to ascertain and determine what claims are valid, and what amount or amounts shall be paid by Great Britain to the United States on account of the liability arising from such failure as to each vessel, according to the extent of such liability as decided by the Arbitrators. The Board of Assessors shall be constituted as follows:—One member thereof shall be named by Her Britannic Majesty, one member thereof shall be named by the President of the United States, and one member thereof shall be named by the representative at Washington of His Majesty the King of Italy; and in case of a vacancy happening from any cause it shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made. As soon as possible after such nominations the Board of Assessors shall be organized in Washington with power to hold their sittings there, or in New York, or in Boston. The members thereof shall severally subscribe a solemn declaration that they will impartially and carefully examine and decide, to the best of their judgment and according to justice and equity, all matters submitted to them, and shall forthwith proceed, under such rules and regulations as they may prescribe, to the investigation of the claims which shall be presented to them by the Government of the United States, and shall examine and decide upon them in such order and manner as they may think proper, but upon such evidence or information only as shall be furnished by or on behalf of the Governments of Great Britain and of the United States respectively. They shall be bound to hear on each separate claim, if required, one person on behalf of each Government as

counsel or agent. A majority of the Assessors in each case shall be sufficient for a decision. The decision of the Assessors shall be given upon each claim in writing, and shall be signed by them respectively and dated. Every claim shall be presented to the Assessors within six months from the day of their first meeting; but they may, for good cause shown, extend the time for the presentation of any claim to a further period not exceeding three months. The Assessors shall report to each Government, at or before the expiration of one year from the date of their first meeting, the amount of claims decided by them up to the date of such report, if further claims then remain undecided, they shall make a further report at or before the expiration of two years from the date of such first meeting; and in case any claims remain undetermined at that time, they shall make a final report within a further period of six months. The report or reports shall be made in duplicate, and one copy thereof shall be delivered to the representative of Her Britannic Majesty at Washington, and one copy thereof to the Secretary of State of the United States. All sums of money which may be awarded under this Article shall be payable at Washington, in coin, within twelve months after the delivery of each report. The Board of Assessors may employ such clerks as they shall think necessary. The expenses of the Board of Assessors shall be borne equally by the two Governments, and paid from time to time, as may be found expedient, on production of accounts certified by the Board. The remuneration of the Assessors shall also be paid by the two Governments in equal moieties in a similar manner.

ARTICLE XI.

The High Contracting Parties engage to consider the result of the proceedings of the Tribunal of Arbitration and of the Board of Assessors, should such Board be appointed, as a full, perfect, and final settlement of all the claims hereinbefore referred to; and further engage that every such claim, whether the same may or may not have been presented to the notice of, made, preferred, or laid before the Tribunal or Board, shall, from and after the conclusion of the proceedings of the Tribunal or Board, be considered and treated as finally settled, barred, and thenceforth inadmissible.

ARTICLE XII.

The High Contracting Parties agree

that all claims on the part of corporations, companies, or private individuals, citizens of the United States, upon the Government of Her Britannic Majesty, arising out of acts committed against the persons or property of citizens of the United States during the period between the 13th of April, 1861, and the 9th of April, 1863, inclusive, not being claims growing out of the acts of the vessels referred to in Art. I. of this Treaty; and all claims, with the like exception, on the part of corporations, companies, or private individuals, subjects of Her Britannic Majesty, upon the Government of the United States, arising out of acts committed against the persons or property of subjects of Her Britannic Majesty during the same period, which may have been presented to either Government for its interposition with the other, and which yet remain unsettled, as well as any other such claims which may be presented within the time specified in Article XIV. of this Treaty, shall be referred to three Commissioners, to be appointed in the following manner,—that is to say, One Commissioner shall be named by Her Britannic Majesty, one by the President of the United States, and a third by Her Britannic Majesty and the President of the United States conjointly; and in case the third Commissioner shall not have been so named within a period of three months from the date of the exchange of the ratifications of this Treaty, then the third Commissioner shall be named by the representative at Washington of His Majesty the King of Spain. In case of the death, absence, or incapacity of any Commissioner, or in the event of any Commissioner omitting or ceasing to act, the vacancy shall be filled in the manner hereinbefore provided for making the original appointment, the period of three months in case of such substitution being calculated from the date of the happening of the vacancy. The Commissioners so named shall meet at Washington at the earliest convenient period after they have been respectively named; and shall, before proceeding to any business, make and subscribe a solemn declaration that they will impartially and carefully examine and decide, to the best of their judgment, and according to justice and equity, all such claims as shall be laid before them on the part of the Governments of Her Britannic Majesty and of the United States respectively, and such declaration shall be entered on the record of their proceedings.

ARTICLE XIII.

The Commissioners shall then forthwith

proceed to the investigations of the claims which shall be presented to them. They shall investigate and decide such claims in such order and such manner as they may think proper, but upon such evidence or information only as shall be furnished by or on behalf of their respective Governments. They shall be bound to receive and consider all written documents or statements which may be presented to them by or on behalf of their respective Governments in support of, or in answer to, any claim; and to hear, if required, one person on each side, on behalf of each Government, as counsel or agent for such Government, on each and every separate claim. A majority of the Commissioners shall be sufficient for an award in each case. The award shall be given upon each claim in writing, and shall be signed by the Commissioners assenting to it. It shall be competent for each Government to name one person to attend the Commissioners as its agent to present and support claims on its behalf, and to answer claims made upon it, and to represent it generally in all matters connected with the investigation and decision thereof. The High Contracting Parties hereby engage to consider the decision of the Commissioners as absolutely final and conclusive upon each claim decided upon by them, and to give full effect to such decisions without any objection, evasion, or delay whatsoever.

ARTICLE XIV.

Every claim shall be presented to the Commissioners within six months from the day of their first meeting, unless in any case where reasons for delay shall be established to the satisfaction of the Commissioners; and then, and in any such case, the period for presenting the claim may be extended by them to any time not exceeding three months longer. The Commissioners shall be bound to examine and decide upon every claim within two years from the day of their first meeting. It shall be competent for the Commissioners to decide in each case whether any claim has or has not been duly made, preferred, and laid before them, either wholly or to any and what extent, according to the true intent and meaning of this Treaty.

ARTICLE XV.

All sums of money which may be awarded by the Commissioners on account of any claim shall be paid by the one Government to the other, as the case may be, within twelve months after the date of

the final award, without interest, and without any deduction save as specified in Article XVI. of this Treaty.

ARTICLE XVI.

The Commissioners shall keep an accurate record and correct minutes or notes of all their proceedings, with the dates thereof, and may appoint and employ a secretary, and any other necessary officer or officers, to assist them in the transaction of the business which may come before them. Each Government shall pay its own Commissioner and agent or counsel. All other expenses shall be defrayed by the two Governments in equal moieties. The whole expenses of the Commission, including contingent expenses, shall be defrayed by a rateable deduction on the amount of the sums awarded by the Commissioners, provided always that such deduction shall not exceed the rate of 5 per cent. on the sums so awarded.

ARTICLE XVII.

The High Contracting Parties engage to consider the result of the proceedings of this Commission as a full, perfect, and final settlement of all such claims as are mentioned in Article XII. of this Treaty upon either Government; and further engage that every such claim, whether or not the same may have been presented to the notice of, made, preferred, or laid before the said Commission, shall, from and after the conclusion of the proceedings of the said Commission be considered and treated as finally settled, barred, and thenceforth inadmissible.

ARTICLE XVIII.

It is agreed by the High Contracting Parties that, in addition to the liberty secured to the United States' fishermen by the Convention between Great Britain and the United States, signed at London on the 20th day of October, 1818, of taking, curing, and drying fish on certain coasts of the British North American Colonies therein defined, the inhabitants of the United States shall have, in common with the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty, the liberty for the term of years mentioned in Article XXIII. of this Treaty, to take fish of every kind, except shell-fish, on the sea-coasts and shores, and in the bays, harbours, and creeks of the Provinces of Quebec, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick, and the colony of Prince Edward's Island, and of the several islands thereunto adjacent, without being

restricted to any distance from the shore, with permission to land upon the said coasts, and shores, and islands, and also upon the Magdalen Islands, for the purpose of drying their nets and curing their fish; provided that, in so doing, they do not interfere with the rights of private property, or with British fishermen, in the peaceable use of any part of the said coasts in their occupancy for the same purpose. It is understood that the above-mentioned liberty applies solely to the sea fishery, and that the salmon and shad fisheries, and all other fisheries in rivers and the mouths of rivers are hereby reserved exclusively for British fishermen.

ARTICLE XIX.

It is agreed by the High Contracting Parties that British subjects shall have, in common with the citizens of the United States, the liberty, for the term of years mentioned in Art. XXXIII. of this Treaty, to take fish of every kind, except shell fish, on the eastern sea-coasts and shores of the United States north of the 39th parallel of north latitude, and on the shores of the several islands thereunto adjacent, and in the bays, harbours, and creeks of the said sea-coasts and shores of the United States and of the said islands, without being restricted to any distance from the shore, with permission to land upon the said coasts of the United States and of the islands aforesaid, for the purpose of drying their nets and curing their fish; provided that in so doing they do not interfere with the rights of private property or with the fishermen of the United States, in the peaceable use of any part of the said coasts in their occupancy for the same purpose. It is understood that the above-mentioned liberty applies solely to the sea fishery, and that salmon and shad fisheries, and all other fisheries in rivers and mouths of rivers are hereby reserved exclusively for fishermen of the United States.

ARTICLE XX.

It is agreed that the places designated by the Commissioners appointed under the first Article of the Treaty between Great Britain and the United States, concluded at Washington on the 5th of June, 1854, upon the coasts of the United States and Her Britannic Majesty's dominions as places reserved from the common right of fishing under that Treaty, shall be regarded as in like manner reserved from the common right of fishing under the preceding Articles. In case any question should arise between the Governments of Her Britannic Majesty and of the United

States as to the common right of fishing in places not thus designated as reserved, it is agreed that a Commission shall be appointed to designate such places, and shall be constituted in the same manner, and have the same powers, duties, and authority as the Commission appointed under the said first Article of the Treaty of the 5th of June, 1854.

ARTICLE XXI.

It is agreed that for the term of years mentioned in Article XXIII. of this Treaty, fish, oil, and fish of all kinds (except fish of the inland lakes, and of the rivers falling into them, and except fish preserved in oil), being the produce of the fisheries of the United States, or of the Dominion of Canada, or of Prince Edward's Island, shall be admitted into each country respectively free of duty.

ARTICLE XXII.

Inasmuch as it is asserted by the Government of Her Britannic Majesty that the privileges accorded to the citizens of the United States under Article XVII. of this Treaty are of greater value than those accorded by Articles XIX. and XXI. of this Treaty to the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty, and this assertion is not admitted by the Government of the United States; it is further agreed that Commissioners shall be appointed to determine, having regard to the privileges accorded by the United States to the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty, as stated in Articles XIX. and XXI. of this Treaty, the amount of any compensation which, in their opinion, ought to be paid by the Government of the United States to the Government of Her Britannic Majesty in return for the privileges accorded to the citizens of the United States under Article XVIII of this Treaty; and that any sum of money which the said Commissioners may so award shall be paid by the United States' Government, in a gross sum, within twelve months after such award shall have been given.

ARTICLE XXIII.

The Commissioners referred to in the preceding Article shall be appointed in the following manner—that is to say:—One Commissioner shall be named by Her Britannic Majesty, one by the President of the United States, and a third by Her Britannic Majesty and the President of the United States conjointly; and in case the third Commissioner shall not have been so named within a period of three months from the date when this Article shall take

effect, then the third Commissioner shall be named by the representative at London of His Majesty the Emperor of Austria and King of Hungary. In case of the death, absence, or incapacity of any Commissioner, or in the event of any Commissioner omitting or ceasing to act, the vacancy shall be filled in the manner hereinbefore provided for making the original appointment, the period of three months in case of such substitution being calculated from the date of the happening of the vacancy. The Commissioners so named shall meet in the city of Halifax, in the Province of Nova Scotia, at the earliest convenient period after they have been respectively named, and shall, before proceeding to any business, make and subscribe a solemn declaration that they will impartially and carefully examine and decide the matters referred to them to the best of their judgment, and according to justice and equity; and such declaration shall be entered on the record of their proceedings. Each of the High Contracting Parties shall also name one person to attend the Commission as its agent, to represent it generally in all matters connected with the Commission.

ARTICLE XXIV.

The proceedings shall be conducted in such order as the Commissioners appointed under Articles XXII. and XXIII. of this Treaty shall determine. They shall be bound to receive such oral or written testimony as either Government may present. If either party shall offer oral testimony, the other party shall have the right of cross-examination, under such rules as the Commissioners shall prescribe. If in the case submitted to the Commissioners either party shall have specified or alluded to any report or document in its own exclusive possession without annexing a copy, such party shall be bound, if the other party thinks proper to apply for it, to furnish that party with a copy thereof, and either party may call upon the other, through the Commissioners, to produce the originals or certified copies of any papers adduced as evidence, giving in each instance such reasonable notice as the Commissioners may require. The case on either side shall be closed within a period of six months from the date of the organization of the Commission, and the Commissioners shall be requested to give their award as soon as possible thereafter. The aforesaid period of six months may be extended for three months in case of a vacancy occurring among the Commissioners under the circumstances contemplated in Article XXIII. of this Treaty.

ARTICLE XXV.

The Commissioners shall keep an accurate record and correct minutes or notes of all their proceedings, with the dates thereof, and may appoint and employ a secretary and any other necessary officer or officers to assist them in the transaction of the business which may come before them. Each of the High Contracting Parties shall pay its own Commissioner and agent or counsel; all other expenses shall be defrayed by the two Governments in equal moieties.

ARTICLE XXVI.

The navigation of the River St. Lawrence, ascending and descending, from the 45th parallel of north latitude, where it ceases to form the boundary between the two countries, from, to, and into the sea, shall for ever remain free and open for the purposes of commerce to the citizens of the United States, subject to any laws and regulations of Great Britain, or of the Dominion of Canada, not inconsistent with such privilege of free navigation. The navigation of the Rivers Yukon, Porcupine, and Stikine, ascending and descending from, to, and into the sea, shall for ever remain free and open for the purpose of commerce to the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty and to the citizens of the United States, subject to any laws and regulations of either country within its own territory not inconsistent with such privilege of free navigation.

ARTICLE XXVII.

The Government of Her Britannic Majesty engages to urge upon the Government of the Dominion of Canada to secure to the citizens of the United States the use of the Welland, St. Lawrence, and other canals in the Dominion on terms of equality with the inhabitants of the Dominion; and the Government of the United States engages that the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty shall enjoy the use of the St. Clair Flats Canal on terms of equality with the inhabitants of the United States, and further engages to urge upon the State Governments to secure to the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty the use of the several State canals connected with the navigation of the lakes or rivers traversed by or contiguous to the boundary line between the possessions of the High Contracting Parties on terms of equality with the inhabitants of the United States.

ARTICLE XXVIII.

The navigation of Lake Michigan shall also, for the term of years mentioned in Article XXXIII. of this Treaty, be free and open for the purposes of commerce to the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty, subject to any laws and regulations of the United States, or of the States bordering thereon, not inconsistent with such privilege of free navigation.

ARTICLE XXIX.

It is agreed that for the term of years mentioned in Article XXXIII. of this Treaty, goods, wares, or merchandise arriving at the ports of New York, Boston, and Portland, and any other ports in the United States which have been or may from time to time be specially designated by the President of the United States, and destined for Her Britannic Majesty's Possessions in North America, may be entered at the proper Custom-house and conveyed in transit, without the payment of duties, through the territory of the United States, under such rules, regulations, and conditions for the protection of the revenue as the Government of the United States may from time to time prescribe; and, under like rules, regulations, and conditions, goods, wares, or merchandise may be conveyed in transit, without the payment of duties, from such possessions through the territory of the United States for export from the said ports of the United States. It is further agreed that for the like period goods, wares, or merchandise arriving at any of the ports of Her Britannic Majesty's possessions in North America and destined for the United States may be entered at the proper Custom-house and conveyed in transit without the payment of duties, through the said possessions, under such rules and regulations, and conditions for the protection of the revenue, as the Governments of the said possessions may from time to time prescribe; and, under like rules, regulations, and conditions, goods, wares, or merchandise may be conveyed in transit, without payment of duties, from the United States through the said possessions to other places in the United States, or for export from ports in the said possessions.

ARTICLE XXX.

It is agreed that for the term of years mentioned in Article XXXIII. of this Treaty, subjects of Her Britannic Majesty may carry in British vessels, without pay-

ment of duty, goods, wares, or merchandise from one port or place within the territory of the United States upon the St. Lawrence, the Great Lakes, and the river connecting the same, to another port or place within the territory of the United States as aforesaid; provided that a portion of such transportation is made through the Dominion of Canada by land carriage and in bond, under such rules and regulations as may be agreed upon between the Government of Her Britannic Majesty and the Government of the United States. Citizens of the United States may for the like period carry in United States vessels, without payment of duty, goods, wares, or merchandise from one port or place within the possessions of Her Britannic Majesty in North America to another port or place within the said possessions; provided that a portion of such transportation is made through the territory of the United States by land carriage and in bond, under such rules and regulations as may be agreed upon between the Government of the United States and the Government of Her Britannic Majesty. The Government of the United States further engages not to impose any export duties on goods, wares, or merchandise carried under this Article through the territory of the United States, and Her Majesty's Government engages to urge the Parliament of the Dominion of Canada and the Legislatures of the other Colonies not to impose any export duties on goods, wares, or merchandise carried under this Article; and the Government of the United States may, in case such export duties are imposed by the Dominion of Canada, suspend, during the period that such duties are imposed, the right of carrying granted under this Article in favour of the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty. The Government of the United States may suspend the right of carrying granted in favour of the subjects of Her Britannic Majesty under this Article in case the Dominion of Canada should at any time deprive the citizens of the United States of the use of the canals in the said Dominion on terms of equality with the inhabitants of the Dominion, as provided in Article XXVII.

ARTICLE XXXI.

The Government of Her Britannic Majesty further engages to urge upon the Parliament of the Dominion of Canada and the Legislature of New Brunswick that no export duty, or other duty, shall be levied on lumber or timber of any kind cut on that portion of the American territory in the State of Maine watered by the

River St. John and its tributaries, and floated down that river to the sea, when the same is shipped to the United States from the Province of New Brunswick. And in case any such export or other duty continues to be levied after the expiration of one year from the date of the exchange of the ratifications of this Treaty, it is agreed that the Government of the United States may suspend the right of carrying hereinbefore granted under Article XXX. of this Treaty for such period as such export or other duty may be levied.

ARTICLE XXXII.

It is further agreed that the provisions and stipulations of Articles XVIII. to XXV. of this Treaty, inclusive, shall extend to the colony of Newfoundland so far as they are applicable. But if the Imperial Parliament, the Legislature of Newfoundland, or the Congress of the United States, shall not embrace the colony of Newfoundland in their laws enacted for carrying the foregoing Articles into effect, then this Article shall be of no effect; but the omission to make provision by law to give it effect, by either of the Legislative bodies aforesaid, shall not in any way impair any other Article of this Treaty.

ARTICLE XXXIII.

The foregoing Articles XVIII. to XXV. inclusive, and Article XXX. of this Treaty, shall take effect as soon as the laws required to carry them into operation shall have been passed by the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain, by the Parliament of Canada, and by the Legislature of Prince Edward's Island on the one hand, and by the Congress of the United States on the other. Such assent having been given, the said Articles shall remain in force for the period of ten years from the date at which they may come into operation, and, further, until the expiration of two years after either of the High Contracting Parties shall have given notice to the other of its wish to terminate the same; each of the High Contracting Parties being at liberty to give such notice to the other at the end of the said period of ten years, or at any time afterward.

ARTICLE XXXIV.

Whereas it was stipulated by Article I. of the Treaty concluded at Washington on the 15th of June, 1846, between Her Britannic Majesty and the United States, that the line of boundary between the

territories of the United States and those of Her Britannic Majesty, from the point on the 49th parallel of north latitude up to which it had already been ascertained, should be continued westward along the said parallel of north latitude "to the middle of the channel which separates the continent from Vancouver's Island, and thence southerly, through the middle of the said channel and of Fuca Straits, to the Pacific Ocean;" and whereas the Commissioners appointed by the two High Contracting Parties to determine that portion of the boundary which runs southerly through the middle of the channel aforesaid were unable to agree upon the same; and whereas the Government of Her Britannic Majesty claims that such boundary line should, under the terms of the Treaty above recited, be run through the Rosario Straits, and the Government of the United States claims that it should be run through the Canal de Haro, it is agreed that the respective claims of the Government of Her Britannic Majesty and of the Government of the United States shall be submitted to the arbitration and award of His Majesty the Emperor of Germany, who, having regard to the above-mentioned Article of the said Treaty, shall decide thereupon, finally and without appeal, which of those claims is most in accordance with the true interpretation of the Treaty of June 15, 1846.

ARTICLE XXXV.

The award of His Majesty the Emperor of Germany shall be considered as absolutely final and conclusive; and full effect shall be given to such award without any objection, evasion, or delay whatsoever. Such decision shall be given in writing and dated. It shall be in whatsoever form His Majesty may choose to adopt; it shall be delivered to the representatives or other public agents of Great Britain and of the United States respectively who may be actually at Berlin, and shall be considered as operative from the day of the date of the delivery thereof.

ARTICLE XXXVI.

The written or printed case of each of the two parties, accompanied by the evidence offered in support of the same, shall be laid before His Majesty the Emperor of Germany within six months from the date of the exchange of the ratifications of this Treaty, and a copy of such case and evidence shall be communicated by each party to the other through their respective representatives at Berlin.

The High Contracting Parties may

include in the evidence to be considered by the Arbitrator such documents, official correspondence, and other official or public statements bearing on the subject of the reference as they may consider necessary to the support of their respective cases.

After the written or printed case shall have been communicated by each party to the other, each party shall have the power of drawing up and laying before the Arbitrator a second and definitive statement, if it think fit to do so, in reply to the case of the other party so communicated, which definitive statement shall be so laid before the Arbitrator, and also be mutually communicated in the same manner as aforesaid by each party to the other within six months from the date of laying the first statement of the case before the Arbitrator.

ARTICLE XXXVII.

If, in the case submitted to the Arbitrator, either party shall specify or allude to any report or document in its own exclusive possession without annexing a copy, such party shall be bound, if the other party thinks proper to apply for it, to furnish that party with a copy thereof, and either party may call upon the other, through the Arbitrator, to produce the originals or certified copies of any papers adduced as evidence, giving in each instance such reasonable notice as the Arbitrator may require. And if the Arbitrator should desire further elucidation or evidence with regard to any point contained in the statements laid before him, he shall be at liberty to require it from either party, and he shall be at liberty to hear one counsel or agent for each party in relation to any matter, and at such time and in such manner as he may think fit.

ARTICLE XXXVIII.

The representatives or other public agents of Great Britain and of the United States at Berlin respectively shall be considered as the agents of their respective Governments to conduct their cases before the Arbitrator, who shall be requested to address all his communications and give all his notices to such representatives or other public agents, who shall represent their respective Governments generally in all matters connected with the arbitration.

ARTICLE XXXIX.

It shall be competent to the Arbitrator to proceed in the said arbitration and all

matters relating thereto as and when he shall see fit, either in person or by a person or persons named by him for that purpose, either in the presence or absence of either or both agents, and either orally or by written discussion or otherwise.

ARTICLE XL.

The Arbitrator may, if he think fit, appoint a secretary or clerk for the purposes of the proposed arbitration, at such rate of remuneration as he shall think proper. This and all other expenses of and connected with the said arbitration shall be provided for as hereinafter stipulated.

ARTICLE XLI.

The Arbitrator shall be requested to deliver, together with his award, an account of all the costs and expenses which he may have been put to in relation

to this matter, which shall forthwith be repaid by the two Governments in equal moieties.

ARTICLE XLII.

The Arbitrator shall be requested to give his award in writing as early as convenient after the whole case on each side shall have been laid before him, and to deliver one copy thereof to each of the said agents.

ARTICLE XLIII.

The present Treaty shall be duly ratified by Her Britannic Majesty, and by the President of the United States of America, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate thereof, and the ratifications shall be exchanged either at London or at Washington within six months from the date hereof, or earlier if possible.

XI.

THE ABOLITION OF PURCHASE.

THE following is the Royal Warrant, dated the 20th of July, 1871, to cancel and determine all Regulations authorizing the Purchase or Sale or Exchange for money of Commissions in the Army, from the 1st of November, 1871, which was presented to Parliament by command of Her Majesty:—

“VICTORIA R.—Whereas by the Act passed in the Session holden in the 5th and 6th years of the reign of King Edward VI., chapter 16, intituled ‘Against buying and selling of offices,’ and the Act passed in the 49th year of the reign of George III., chapter 126, intituled ‘An Act for the prevention of the sale and brokerage of offices,’ all officers in our Forces are prohibited from selling or bargaining for the sale of any Commission in our Forces, and from taking or receiving any money for the exchange of any such Commission, under the penalty of forfeiture of their Commissions and of being cashiered, and of divers other penalties, but the last-mentioned Act exempts from the penalties of the said Acts purchases, or sales, or exchanges of any Commissions in our Forces for such prices as may be regulated and fixed by any regulation made or to be made by us in that behalf:

“And whereas we think it expedient

to put an end to all such regulations, and to all sales and purchases and all exchanges for money of Commissions in our Forces, and all dealings relating to such sales, purchases, or exchanges:—

“Now, our will and pleasure is that on and after the 1st day of November, in this present year, all regulations made by us or any of our Royal predecessors, or any officers acting under our authority, regulating or fixing the prices at which any Commissions in our Forces may be purchased, sold, or exchanged, or in any way authorizing the purchase or sale or exchange for money of any such Commissions, shall be cancelled and determined.

“Given at our Court at Osborne, this 20th day of July, in the 35th year of our reign.

“By Her Majesty’s Command,
“EDWARD CARDWELL.”

On the 31st October the following Royal Warrant was published:—

“VICTORIA R.—Whereas by our Warrant of July 20th, 1871, we deemed it expedient to cancel and determine on and after November 1st in this present year all Regulations made by us or any of our Royal predecessors, or any officers acting under our authority, regulating or fixing the prices at which any Commission in our Forces may be purchased, sold, or

exchanged, or in any way authorizing the purchase, or sale, or exchange for money of any such commissions;

"Our will and pleasure is—

"That the undermentioned Articles of our Warrant of December 27, 1870, be cancelled accordingly:—

"Articles 33 (paragraph *a*), 36 (paragraph *a*), so much of Article 40 as relates to regimental promotion, Articles 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 61, 62, 63, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 102, 109, 959, 961, 967, 968, 969, 970.

"And whereas it is expedient, pending a more complete revision of that section of our said Warrant of December 27, 1870, which now governs the promotion of combatant officers, to provide at once for certain necessary changes in respect of first appointments, regimental promotion, and exchanges;

"Our will and pleasure is—

"That this Warrant be established and obeyed from November 1st in this present year, in respect of all matters herein contained, and that it be construed, administered, and interpreted with our said Warrant of December 27, 1870.

"I.—FIRST APPOINTMENTS.

"*Sub-Lieutenants.*

"1. A commission as sub-lieutenant in our army may be given:—(*a*) To a successful candidate at a competitive examination in general subjects to be held under such regulations as may be issued from time to time by our Secretary of State. (*b*) To a student from the University of Oxford, Cambridge, Durham, London, Dublin, Edinburgh, St. Andrew's, Glasgow, Aberdeen, or the Queen's University, Ireland, who has passed "Responsions" at Oxford, the "Previous Examination" at Cambridge, or the corresponding examination at the other Universities—under such regulations with respect to the age and manner of selection of such candidates as may be issued from time to time by our Secretary of State. (*c*) To our cadets styled "Queen's Cadets," to those styled "Indian Cadets," and to our Pages of Honour. These cadets and pages of honour shall pass such a qualifying examination in general subjects as may be fixed from time to time by our Secretary of State. (*d*) To a non-commissioned officer who is recommended for promotion by our Commander-in-Chief, and who shall pass such a professional examination as may be fixed from time to time by our Secretary of State.

"2. Sub-lieutenants, in order to qualify for the rank of lieutenant, shall be required to serve satisfactorily for twelve months with one of our regiments, and after such service (except in the case of non-commissioned officers promoted to be sub-lieutenants) to go through such a course of study and to pass such a professional examination as may be fixed from time to time by our Secretary of State.

"3. Sub-lieutenants shall be removed from our service for moral or physical unfitness, or if they fail to pass satisfactorily through the prescribed course of study. They shall (except in the case of non-commissioned officers promoted to be sub-lieutenants) be required to pass the professional examination for the rank of lieutenant within three years, failing to do which they shall be removed from our service. Their time for retirement on full or half-pay shall be reckoned from the date of their commissions as lieutenants; and in fixing the date of such commissions, such portion of their service as sub-lieutenants may be allowed as their conduct and qualifications may merit, according to regulations to be issued from time to time by our Secretary of State.

"4. Sub-lieutenants appointed to a cavalry regiment who are not qualified for service in the Cavalry may be transferred to the Infantry.

"*Appointment from the Militia.*

"5. A commission as lieutenant in our army may be given to a lieutenant of one of our regiments of Militia, under such regulations as to age or otherwise as may be issued from time to time by our Secretary of State. The officer shall pass a professional examination similar to that which will be required of a sub-lieutenant of our army before he receives a commission as lieutenant.

"II.—PROMOTION.

"*Lieutenants.*

"6. A sub-lieutenant in our army may receive a commission as lieutenant:—(*a*) If he has been promoted to the rank of sub-lieutenant from the rank of a non-commissioned officer—after a satisfactory service of not less than twelve months as a sub-lieutenant. (*b*) In the case of other sub-lieutenants—after a satisfactory service of not less than twelve months with one of our regiments, and after having gone through a course of study and passed a professional examination, as laid down in Article 2.

"Captains.

"7. A qualified lieutenant shall be eligible for promotion to the rank of captain after two years' service in our army. In the case of officers entering our army after August 26, 1871, this service shall date from the date of their commissions as lieutenants; in the case of other officers from the date of their first commissions.

"Majors.

"8. A qualified captain shall be eligible for promotion to the rank of major after six years' service in our army. In the case of officers entering our army after August 26, 1871, this service shall date from the date of their commissions as lieutenants; in the case of other officers from the date of their first commissions.

"Lieutenant-Colonels.

"9. A qualified officer holding the substantive rank of major shall be eligible for promotion to the rank of lieutenant-colonel.

"General Rules.

"10. Every promotion shall be made upon the recommendation of our Commander-in-Chief, with the approval of our Secretary of State.

"11. Succession to vacancies shall be regulated as follows:—

"(a) If a vacancy shall arise—(1) By the promotion of an officer to the rank of major-general, (2) by the death of an officer, (3) by an officer becoming supernumerary under Article 21, or (4) by an officer being promoted to fill a vacancy in another regiment or corps—The promotions in the several ranks necessary to fill the vacancy shall, unless it shall be expedient that the vacancies be otherwise filled, be given to the senior qualified officer of each lower rank in the regiment or corps, except in the case of promotion to be lieutenant-colonel, in which case the vacancy shall be filled by a qualified officer to be selected by our Commander-in-Chief with the approval of our Secretary of State.

"(b) If a vacancy shall arise from any other cause, it shall be filled by a qualified officer of our army, who shall be selected by our Commander-in-Chief with the approval of our Secretary of State.

"12. No selection shall be made in succession to any vacancy caused by the retirement of an officer until such retirement shall have been completed and shall have appeared in the *London Gazette*.

"13. Officers below the rank of field-

officer shall not be recommended to us for promotion unless they shall have previously passed such professional examination as may be fixed from time to time by our Secretary of State. Officers serving with their regiments at distant foreign stations may be provisionally promoted to vacancies previous to passing such examination, but such promotion shall be cancelled should the officer fail in his examination. Captains now in our service may be appointed majors without examination if specially reported to and approved by our Commander-in-Chief as having proved their efficiency for the rank of major.

"14. Lieutenants shall be required to pass the professional examination for the rank of captain within five years from the date of their commission as lieutenants, failing to do which they shall be removed from our service, and may receive a sum not exceeding one year's pay; provided that in cases of exigencies our Secretary of State may enlarge the time allowed for their examination. Officers now in our service who received their first commissions before August 26, 1871, shall not be liable to the provisions of this Article.

"III.—TENURE OF APPOINTMENTS OF MAJOR AND LIEUTENANT-COLONEL IN A REGIMENT.

"15. The appointment of major in a regiment or battalion shall, in the case of officers so appointed after the date of this Warrant, be held in the first instance for five years; the officer being eligible for re-appointment. If not re-appointed, he shall receive half-pay.

"16. The appointment of lieutenant-colonel of a regiment or battalion shall, in the case of officers so appointed after the date of this Warrant, be held in the first instance for five years, and may be renewed if it appear to our Commander-in-Chief, with the approval of our Secretary of State, that such renewal is desirable for the good of our service. If the officer be not re-appointed, he shall receive half-pay.

"IV.—ROYAL ARTILLERY AND ENGINEERS.

"17. The foregoing Articles of the Warrant—viz., Articles 1 to 16, shall not apply to our Royal Artillery or Royal Engineers.

"V.—EXCHANGES.

"18. Subject to the sanction of our Commander-in-Chief, officers of equal substantive rank on full pay, serving in our Cavalry, Infantry of the Line, and

Colonial Corps, and officers (below the substantive rank of field-officer) in our Indian Staff Corps may exchange from one regiment or corps to another, and officers of equal substantive rank on full pay serving in brigades of Royal Artillery, in companies of Royal Engineers, or in regiments of more than one battalion may exchange from one brigade, company of Royal Engineers, or battalion to another, providing that the commanding officers of the officers exchanging certify that the desired exchange does not originate in any cause affecting the honour, character, or professional efficiency of the officers, and provided also that a certificate of a military medical officer be transmitted in each case, declaring that the officer is in a fit state to serve at the station where the corps, brigade, battalion, or company into which he applies to exchange is quartered. Each officer shall also declare that it is his *bonâ fide* intention to join immediately and do duty in the corps, brigade, battalion, or company to which he proposes to exchange; and no officer shall be permitted to retire within six months of the date of his exchange, excepting in the case of ill-health or other emergency, which shall be specially considered.

"19. An officer so exchanging shall be permitted to defray all fair and reasonable expenses incurred through such exchange by the officer with whom he exchanges, provided that the sum to be paid be approved by our Commander-in-Chief before payment is made.

"20. An officer exchanging into a regiment shall be placed, for regimental seniority, below all officers holding the same regimental rank at the time of his exchange.

"VI.—SUPERNUMERARY OFFICERS.

"21. An officer may be retained on the strength of his regiment or corps as a supernumerary—

"1st. In case of a reduction in the establishment of a regiment or corps when his retention is authorized by our Secretary of State;

"2nd. If, in the case of a field-officer belonging to a regiment or battalion serving in India, he be appointed to a brigade command or to a Staff situation in that country tenable by a regimental officer for the usual period of five years;

"3rd. When appointed to be—(a) Assistant adjutant and quarter-master general if a substantive major; (b) Professor, instructor, or other officer on the establishment of our Royal Military College, Royal Military Academy, or Staff College; (c) Garrison instructor, deputy

assistant adjutant-general for musketry, captain instructor or lieutenant instructor of musketry; (d) Adjutant in a regiment or corps of our auxiliary forces; or to hold such other appointments as may be fixed from time to time by our Secretary of State with the approval of the Lords Commissioners of our Treasury.

"22. An officer supernumerary to the establishment of his regiment or corps shall retain his military position and be eligible for promotion precisely as if he had remained on the active list of such regiment or corps.

"23. A supernumerary officer under Article 21, on being promoted to a lieutenant-colonelcy or majority in a regiment or corps, shall join the regiment or corps to which he may be promoted.

"24. A supernumerary officer who completes the term of service fixed for his appointment, or resigns it on satisfactory grounds, shall rejoin his regiment as supernumerary in his rank, except in the case of a substantive major, who shall receive half-pay until absorbed, retaining his regimental position.

"25. A supernumerary officer who resigns his appointment on unsatisfactory grounds, or is displaced therefrom for misconduct or incapacity, unless he be removed from our army, shall receive a reduced rate of half-pay of such amount and for such period as our Secretary of State may decide, taking into consideration the length and character of the services rendered by the officer.

"26. If a supernumerary officer shall die, be promoted, or retire, or if any officer of the rank in which there is a supernumerary officer waiting absorption under Article 23 shall die, be promoted, or retire, no promotion shall take place in succession to such vacancy.

"27. Cases of reduction of establishment shall be specially considered, and such arrangements made for the gradual absorption of supernumerary officers as may be approved by the Lords Commissioners of our Treasury.

"VII.—PROVISIONAL ARRANGEMENTS.

"28. Cornets and ensigns in our army appointed before the 26th day of August, 1871, and cornets and ensigns in our army appointed after such date who passed from our Royal Military College on the A list may be promoted at once to the rank of lieutenant. No greater number of lieutenants than that allowed by the establishment which may be fixed for the year shall receive lieutenant's pay, and no officer shall receive such pay until he shall have passed the examination required

by the existing regulations for the rank of lieutenant.

"29. Other cornets and ensigns in our army appointed after the 26th day of August, 1871, candidates who have passed the examination for direct commissions before the date of this our Warrant, candidates for commissions in the Household Cavalry and Foot Guards who are nominated to fill the vacancies which occur in such regiments previous to the date of the first competitive examination for sub-lieutenancies and who pass a qualifying examination, and candidates from the Universities now on the list of our Commander-in-Chief may receive commissions as sub-lieutenants.

"30. Such sub-lieutenants as have passed satisfactorily through a course of study at our Royal Military College may be promoted to the rank of lieutenant after twelve months' satisfactory service with one of our regiments.

"Given at our Court at Balmoral this 30th day of October, 1871, in the 35th year of our reign.

"By Her Majesty's command,
"EDWARD CARDWELL."

The following explanatory memorandum accompanies the Royal Warrant —

"The scope of the present Warrant is confined to making those changes which are rendered immediately necessary by the abolition of Purchase, and it therefore deals only with the subjects of first appointments, regimental promotion in the Cavalry and Infantry of the Line, and exchanges.

"2. Questions affecting the Household Cavalry and Foot Guards are under the consideration of Her Majesty's Government, and the promotions which have heretofore carried superior army rank are for the time to be suspended.

"3. The Regulations which are required for the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of the Warrant are either published along with it or are in course of preparation, and will be issued shortly.

"4. In the meantime, the following explanatory statement has been drawn up for general information.

"5. Commissions as lieutenants will be given to all cornets and ensigns appointed before the 26th of August, 1871, and to cornets and ensigns appointed since that date from the A list at Sandhurst, their commissions to date from the 1st of November.

"6. Commissions as sub-lieutenant will be given to—

"(a) All other cornets and ensigns

appointed after the 26th of August, 1871, the rank of cornet and ensign being abolished

"(b) Candidates who have passed the examination for direct commissions, in their turn as vacancies occur.

"(c) Candidates for commissions in the Household Cavalry and Foot Guards who are nominated to fill the vacancies which occur in those regiments before the date of the first competitive examination for sub-lieutenancies, and who pass a qualifying examination.

"(d) Candidates from the Universities now on the Commander-in-Chief's list.

"7. Sub-Lieutenants will be attached for a year to regiments at home. They will then be required to go through a course of instruction, and on passing a practical professional examination, be commissioned to regiments as lieutenants. They will be under strict discipline, and will be liable to be removed for unfitness, either moral or physical, and for misconduct. Those unsuited to the Cavalry may be transferred to the Infantry.

"8. In dating their commissions they will be allowed a portion, not exceeding one year, of their services as sub-lieutenants; the time allowed being determined by the class of certificate they receive after their year's regimental training, their conduct while under instruction, and their position at the final examination. Their service for retirement will reckon from the date of their commissions as lieutenants.

"9. Candidates who have passed the examination for direct commissions, and have also passed satisfactorily through a year's course of study at the Royal Military College before being appointed to be sub-lieutenants, and Sandhurst cadets from the B list will be commissioned to regiments as lieutenants on serving satisfactorily for twelve months with a regiment as sub-lieutenants.

"10. There are now a large number of supernumerary officers, and also a large number of candidates who have passed for commissions.

"11. The absorption of supernumerary officers will probably be completed, and the candidates who have passed for commissions have received their appointments in about two years from the present time, and personal appointments in the army will then only be given as follows:—

"(a) To successful candidates at a competitive examination.

"(b) To non-commissioned officers recommended for promotion by the Field-Marshal Commanding-in-Chief.

"(c) To candidates from the Universities.

"(d) To Queen's Cadets, India Cadets, and Pages of Honour.

"(e.) To lieutenants of Militia.

"12. The competitive examination will be carried out by the Civil Service Commissioners; the standard of qualification being that recommended by the Royal Commission on Military Education. Ample notice will be given of the first examination, and there will be no advantage in any application being made for admission to be examined before the publication of such notice.

"13. Non-commissioned officers, on being selected for promotion, will pass an examination in certain professional subjects; and then, after twelve months' satisfactory service as sub-lieutenants, will receive commissions as lieutenants.

"14. A certain number of sub-lieutenancies a year will be allotted to candidates who have passed the University examination specified in the Regulations. If they also pass the examination for the degree of B.A. they will be allowed two years' extension of the limit of age. University candidates will be required to give at least six months' notice of their desire to be admitted into the army. If in any year there should be more candidates than appointments, the requisite number will be chosen by competition between the candidates; after their appointment they will go through the same course as other sub-lieutenants.

"15. There will be no vacancies for two years for any candidates from the Universities whose names are not now on the Commander-in-Chief's list.

"16. Queen's and Indian Cadets and Queen's Pages will be required to pass a qualifying examination, which for the present will be the same as that recommended by the Royal Commission on Military Education. The nominations will remain as heretofore. When appointed, cadets and pages will go through the same course as other sub-lieutenants.

"17. First appointments as subalterns in the Militia will be made on the recommendation of the Lieutenants of counties. Candidates, before receiving their commissions as lieutenants in the Militia, will be required to pass a qualifying examination in general subjects equal to the standard fixed as necessary for a candidate for a sub-lieutenancy. They will next be required to be attached to a regiment of the Line for three months, or such time as may be necessary to teach them their drill. After serving with their Militia regiments for two annual trainings, they will be eligible for the appointment of lieutenants in the army. In order to obtain such an appointment they

must be recommended by the commanding officer of their Militia regiment, his recommendation being confirmed by the General Officer commanding the district, and they will be required to pass an examination in professional subjects of the same kind as that which will be required of a sub-lieutenant before he receives his commission as lieutenant.

"18. The limits of age, except for non-commissioned officers, will be fixed at from 17 to 20 for sub-lieutenants, the limit being raised to 22 in the case of candidates who have passed their examination for the degree of B.A. at the Universities, and from 19 to 22 for the lieutenants from the Militia.

"19. So far as it is possible to calculate beforehand, the vacancies on the present establishment of officers in the army will provide for about 200 admissions a year by competition, and for one commission a year for each Militia regiment of ten companies, and for the smaller regiments in proportion, besides the number allowed for candidates from the Universities, non-commissioned officers, &c.

"20. In addition to the examinations hitherto required from regimental officers, those who are promoted to the rank of captain after the 1st November will, before being promoted to the rank of major, be required to pass a professional examination.

"21. The necessary alterations in the Queen's Regulations with respect to this and other examinations will be made public as soon as possible.

"22. Adjutancies of the Auxiliary Forces will in future be filled by half-pay officers or by officers belonging to regiments, who will be made supernumerary to their regiments while so serving. The appointments will be held in the first instance for a term of five years; but if their service prove unsatisfactory, they will be liable to be sent back to their regiments, or put upon a reduced rate of half-pay under Article 25 of the Warrant at any time; if satisfactory, they will be eligible for re-appointment after the expiration of their first period.

"23. It is not intended to interpose any obstacle in the way of exchanges between officers on full pay which are made to suit the reasonable convenience of officers. It is therefore provided that an officer wishing to exchange shall be permitted to defray the fair and reasonable expenses of the officer with whom he exchanges, provided the sum to be paid is approved by the Commander-in-Chief. Precautions have been taken, in the Queen's Regulations for the army, to guard against any abuse of such arrangements.

"EDWARD CARDWELL."

**GROSS RECEIPTS FROM CUSTOMS AND EXCISE IN
THE UNITED KINGDOM DURING THE FINANCIAL
YEAR ENDED 31st MARCH, 1871.**

CUSTOMS DUTIES (on Articles usually contributing not less than £1,000 annually).			CUSTOMS DUTIES.— <i>continued.</i>		
	£	s. d.		£	s. d.
Beer Spruce	2,385	9 3	Warehouse Rents, &c.	12,490	8 1
— Of other Sorts, in- cluding Mum	1,103	1 11	Proceeds of Goods sold for the Duties, &c. . .	6,614	1 10
Chicory	110,734	17 9	Fees received under Merchant Shipping Act, Part 2	413	0 0
Cocoa, Cocoa Husks, and Chocolate	32,429	7 10	Moneys received from the Board of Trade in reimbursements of Charges incurred under the Merchant Shipping Act	13,723	7 7
Coffee	420,145	5 2	Proceeds of Sale of Premises, Old Stores, &c., &c.	7,486	15 11
Currants	292,914	2 3	Moneys received from the Merchants in re- spect of the special attendance of officers given on their appli- cation	17,277	14 7
Figs	30,213	6 2	Total	£22,575,463	13 5
Ginger, Preserved	872	17 10	Deductions on account of Drawbacks, Re- payments on Over Entries, &c.	£2,336,583	18 9
Plate, Gold and Silver, Plums, Dried or Pre- served, French Plums and Prunellos	4,608	12 1	Net Produce	£20,238,879	14 8
Prunes	6,306	2 0			
Raisins	123,334	0 9	EXCISE DUTIES.		
Spirits, Colonial and Foreign:—			Chicory	16,982	11 6 ³ / ₄
Rum	1,975,209	0 6	Licenses	3,751,356	2 5 ¹ / ₄
Brandy	1,866,238	0 4	Malt	7,208,299	9 0 ¹ / ₂
Geneva	80,880	5 7	Race Horses	9,189	19 0
Of other Sorts	500,121	17 6	Railways	506,122	14 9 ¹ / ₂
Succades and Confec- tionery, including Fruits and Vege- tables preserved in Sugar	2,745	6 0	Spirits	11,923,301	14 2
Sugar, Unrefined	2,981,834	2 11	Sugar	103,359	10 7 ¹ / ₄
— Refined. and Sugar Candy	501,531	16 8		£23,521,915	1 7 ¹ / ₄
— Molasses	46,564	7 2	Fines, Forfeitures, and Costs recovered	17,113	11 1
Tea	3,237,545	18 9	Sums received from Contributors to late Scotch Excise Incor- poration Fund, per Act 5 & 6 Will. IV., c. 72	369	17 3 ¹ / ₂
Tobacco and Snuff	6,663,227	18 8	Miscellaneous	11,112	0 2 ¹ / ₄
Wine	1,586,831	13 9	Total Excise	£23,550,510	10 2 ¹ / ₂
All other Articles	6,332	17 8	Drawbacks, Discounts, and Allowances	£716,603	6 8 ¹ / ₂
	£20,489,042	11 2	Net Produce	£22,833,907	3 6
Duties collected on be- half of the Inland Revenue on the de- livery for Home Con- sumption of British Spirits deposited in the Customs Ware- houses (under Act 27 & 28 Vict., c. 11)	1,944,702	14 1			
Charges on delivery from the Bonded Warehouses	39,923	11 1			
Duties collected at the Isle of Man	43,759	9 1			
Rents of Legal Quays,					

GROSS RECEIPTS FROM STAMPS IN THE UNITED KINGDOM DURING THE FINANCIAL YEAR ENDED THE 31st MARCH, 1871:—

	£	s.	d.	Fee Stamps, viz.	£	s.	d.
Deeds and other Instruments, not included under the following heads . . .	1,678,218	1	10½	Admiralty Court . . .	7,519	15	0
Probates of Wills and Letters of Administration . . .	1,989,318	11	10	Bankruptcy Court . . .	46,047	2	1
Bills of Exchange . . .	775,890	4	9	Chancery Court . . .	110,165	13	4
Bankers' Notes . . .	1,360	0	0	Chancery Fund . . .	4,386	8	9
Composition for the Duties on the Bills and Notes of the Banks of England and Ireland, and of Country Bankers . . .	181,626	15	1	Civil Bill Fund . . .	14,148	13	0
Receipts, Drafts, and other Id. Stamps . . .	628,908	10	5	Civil Service Commission . . .	1,599	10	0
Marine Insurances . . .	100,438	17	6	Common Law Courts	81,138	11	6
Licenses and Certificates	131,415	6	11	Companies Registration . . .	9,972	17	0
Newspapers and Supplements . . .	52,291	17	5	Copyhold, &c., Commission . . .	8,125	17	6
Medicine	71,313	5	0	Divorce and Matrimonial Causes . . .	3,233	0	0
Legacies and Successions	2,963,372	10	3	Judgments Registry Fund	3,731	1	6
Gold and Silver Plate . . .	62,466	12	7	Land Registry . . .	1,097	0	0
Cards	12,667	10	6	Law Fund	9,672	11	8
Patents for Inventions	118,839	5	0	Naturalization . . .	320	10	0
	£8,721,160	9	1¾	Probate Court . . .	148,760	5	11
				Public Record . . .	489	0	0
				Record of Title . . .	25	10	0
				Registration of Deeds	11,101	7	0
				Penalties in Law Proceedings and Costs recovered	11,950	7	6
				Miscellaneous	904	18	7½
				Gross Total . . .	£9,196,140	9	6½
				Drawbacks, Discounts, Allowances, &c.	£216,411	12	11½
				Net Produce . . .	£8,979,728	16	7

GROSS RECEIPTS FROM TAXES IN THE UNITED KINGDOM DURING THE FINANCIAL YEAR ENDED THE 31st OF MARCH, 1871:—

HEADS OF DUTY.

	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
Land Tax on Lands and Tenements . . .	1,104,540	8	7	ceedings and Costs recovered	686	12	2
Duties on Offices and Pensions	672	6	0	Miscellaneous	407	18	4½
Assessed Taxes.				Total Land and Assessed Taxes . . .	£2,739,858	10	7½
Schedules:				Allowances and Repayments, &c.	£14,546	14	9½
B. Inhabited Houses	1,129,451	5	1¾	Net Produce	2,721,211	15	10
C. Servants	101,953	2	6	Property and Income Tax	6,419,595	2	3¾
D. Carriages	178,925	5	2	Allowances and Repayments	128,983	15	2½
E. Horses for Riding	117,949	10	6	Net Produce	£6,290,611	7	1¼
F. Other Horses and Mules	68,191	0	0	Total Net Produce of Taxes	£9,015,823	2	11½
H. Horse Dealers . . .	6,594	7	0				
I. Hair Powder	408	0	0				
K. Armorial Bearings	29,419	7	2				
Additional 10 per Cent. per Act 3 Vict., c. 17	659	8	0				
Penalties in Law Pro-							

THE payments into the Exchequer for the financial year 1870-71 were, for Excise £1,128,000, and for Stamps £118,000 in excess of the estimate. The Income Tax realized the exact amount estimated, £6,300,000. An increase of £100,000 in the Probate Duties was chiefly owing to two large payments of £16,500 and £25,500 for properties valued respectively at £3,200,000 and £1,800,000.

NATIONAL DEBT.—The following table shows the annual charge on the total amount of the Unredeemed Funded Debt for the Financial Year ended the 31st of March, 1871.—

GREAT BRITAIN.			Annual Charges.		
	£	s. d.		£	s. d.
Unredeemed Capital	21,053,600	7 0	Capital raised and inscribed for the purposes of the Telegraph Acts, 1868-69, per 32 & 33 Vict., c. 73, ss. 13 & 15	9,000	0 0
Annuities per 18 Vict. c. 18, expiring 5 April, 1885	116,000	0 0	Capital retransferred from the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt, the Dividends upon which had remained unclaimed 10 years and upwards, the same having been reclaimed by the proprietors thereof 56 Geo. III., c. 60	1,533	14 10½
Annuities, per 23 & 24 Vict., c. 109, and subsequent Acts, expiring 5 April, 1885 (Fortifications)	406,757	0 0	Annuities for terms of Years (expiring at various periods of the year 1885), granted per Act 29 Vict., c. 5, in lieu of Stock, held on account of Post Office Savings Banks, cancelled (as per contra)	553,887	0 0
Annuities, per 26 Vict., c. 14, expiring 5 April, 1885	9,983	7 3	Annuities for a limited Term of Years, granted per 10 Geo. IV., c. 24, and 3 Will. IV., c. 14, expiring at various periods	12,227	7 9
Annuities, per 32 & 33 Vict., c. 59, expiring at various dates in 1885 (payable yearly)	2,412,277	0 0	Annuities (expiring 1885), granted per Act 30 & 31 Vict., c. 145 (Fortifications)	13,328	0 0
Annuities for a limited Term of Years, per 10 Geo. IV., c. 24, and 3 Will. IV., c. 14, expiring at various periods	51,298	10 0	Life Annuities, granted per 10 Geo. IV., c. 24, 3 Will. IV., c. 14, and 16 & 17 Vict., c. 45	48,128	7 0
Red Sea Telegraph Company's Annuity, 25 & 26 Vict., c. 39	36,000	0 0	Contributors' Shares, Tontine 1789, increased	282	18 6
Life Annuities, 48 Geo. III., c. 142, and subsequent Acts	957,581	18 8	Total Debt created or transferred in Great Britain, between 31st March, 1870, and 31st March, 1871 :—		
Life Annuities, 18 & 19 Geo. III., and English Tontine Annuities, 29 Geo. III.	12,227	7 9	Capital transferred from the Funded Debt in Ireland to the Funded Debt in Great Britain, 5 Geo. IV., c. 53	32,287	3 2
Irish Tontine Annuities, 13 & 14, 15 & 16 and 19 & 20 Geo. III. (Irish Acts), payable in Great Britain	15,830	11 0			
Management	213,846	9 10			
Total Debt at 31st March, 1870	25,285,402	10 9			
Debt created or transferred from Ireland between 31st March, 1870 and 31st March, 1871 :—					
Capital transferred from the Funded Debt in Ireland to the Funded Debt in Great Britain, 5 Geo. IV., c. 53	32,287	3 2			
			General Total, Great Britain	£25,947,648	18 9½

NATIONAL DEBT, *continued.*

IRELAND.			Annual Charges.		
	£	s. d.		£	s. d.
On 31st March, 1870:—			National Debt, the		
Unredeemed Capital	1,158,753	17 2½	Dividends on which		
Management . . .	10,797	14 5	had remained un-		
			claimed 10 years or		
			upwards, the same		
Total Debt at 31st			having been re-		
March, 1870 .	£1,169,551	11 7½	claimed by the pro-		
			prietors, 23 & 2½		
To Capital transferred			Vict., c. 71 . . .	25	18 5½
from the Funded					
Debt in Great Bri-			Total Debt created or		
tian to the Funded			transferred in Ire-		
Debt in Ireland, 5			land, between 31st		
Geo. IV., c. 53 . .	11,195	16 10½	March, 1870, and 31st		
To Capital retrans-			March, 1871 . . .	11,221	15 4
ferred from the Com-					
missioners for the			General Total, Ireland	£1,180,773	6 11½
Reduction of the					

The following statement gives the summary of the charges on account of the National Debt for the financial year ended the 31st March, 1871:—

Total unredeemed debt		March, 1870, and	
on the 31st March,		31st March, 1871:—	
1870:—		Great Britain . . .	662,246 8 0½
Great Britain . . .	25,285,402	Ireland	11,221 15 4
Ireland	1,169,551		
	£26,454,954		673,468 3 4½
Debt created or trans-		Total .	£27,128,422 5 9½
ferred between 31st			

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Jan. 10. Right Hon. W. Monsell; to be Postmaster General.

— 17. Vice Chancellor Bacon, John Maclean; Knights.

Hon. C. G. Cornwallis Elhot; Groom of the Chamber to Her Majesty.

Rev B. M. Cowie; Chaplain to Her Majesty.

— 20. Right Hon. Chichester Fortescue; President of the Board of Trade.

— 27. Lord Aveland; Deputy Chamberlain of England.

E A. C. Schalch; Attorney-General of Jamaica.

— 31. James Sant, R.A.; Principal Painter to Her Majesty.

Feb. 3. Sir T. E. May; Under Clerk of the Parliaments.

Rev. J. M. Hawker; Prebend and Treasurer of Exeter Cathedral

— 7. Rev. R. Payne Smith, D.D.; Dean of Canterbury.

R. F. D. Palgrave; Clerk Assistant to the House of Commons.

A. J. S. Milman; Second Clerk Assistant of the House of Commons.

— 10. Henry Court; Puisne Judge for Trinidad.

— 14. A. Tremayne; Sheriff of Cornwall.

C. R. Turner; Knight.

— 17. Rev. Daniel Moore; Chaplain to Her Majesty.

Lieutenant-Colonel C. Herbert; Consul General at Bagdad.

— 24. The Right Hon. G. J. Goschen; First Lord of the Admiralty.

Hon. A. H. Gordon (Governor of Mauritius), Sir R. G. McDonnell (Governor of Hong Kong); Knights Commanders of St. Michael and St. George.

A. Musgrave (Governor of British Columbia), J. R. Longden (Governor of Trinidad), G. Elliott, J. H. Gray; Companions of St. Michael and St. George.

The Rev. J. B. Lightfoot, D.D.; Canon of St. Paul's.

March 10. The Right Hon. J. Stansfeld; Poor Law Commissioner for England.

— 14. Col. Sir G. J. Wolseley; C.B. Military Division.

— 21. Sir W. Henry Bulwer; Baron Dalling, of Dalling, co. Norfolk.

Sir William R. Mansfield; Baron Sandhurst, of Sandhurst, co. Berks.

James Fleming; Chancellor of the County Palatine of Durham

— 24. Sir J. M. Macleod, Sir J. Stuart; Privy Councillors.

W. Bailey, W. E. Currey; Inspectors of Schools in England.

A. Ogilvy Barrie, Inspector of Schools in Scotland.

— 28. W. Boxall, R.A., George Elvey, W. Sterndale Bennett, Julius Benedict; Knights.

— 31. Victor Biddulph; Page of Honour to Her Majesty.

Horace Rumbold; Secretary to the Embassy at Constantinople.

F. Clare Ford; Secretary to the Embassy at St. Petersburg.

H. P. Turner Barron; Secretary to the Legation at Brussels.

April 11. The Marquess of Normanby; Governor of Queensland

Major-Gen. Lefroy; Governor of the Bermudas

W. H. Rennie; Lieutenant-Governor of St. Vincent.

Sanford Freeling; Lieutenant-Governor of Grenada.

T. Lett Wood; Chief Justice of the Bermudas.

— 18. John Wickens; Vice Chancellor.

— 21. Earl Cowper; Captain of Her Majesty's Gentlemen at-Arms.

May 2. Maxwell Melvill; Puisne Judge of Bombay.

— 5. John Lambert, C.B.; Civil Division.

— 9. Lieut.-Col. John Stokes, R.E.; C.B. Civil Division.

May 12. W. H. Medhurst (Consul at Hankow), Consul at Shanghai.

A Raby (Consul at Jeddah); Consul at Syra.

Neill McLean; Consul at Batavia.

H. E. Bulwer, Consul General in Borneo.

— 16. His Royal Highness Prince Arthur, Earl Cowper; Privy Councillors. Rev. J. Percival; Prebend of Exeter.

— 19. Rear-Admiral Richards, G. B. Airy, Lieut.-Col. H. Y. D. Scott, R.E., C. R. Markham; C.B. Civil Division.

The Right Hon. J. Moncrieff, Justice Clerk; Baronet.

The Right Hon. Sir R. J. Phillimore; Judge Advocate-General *ad interim*.

June 13. Major-General Pears; K.C.B., Civil Division; W. H. Stephenson; C.B., Civil Division.

Henry David Erskine; Gentleman-Usher of the Privy Chamber, in place of Hon. Fred. Byng.

Thomas John Elmore (Vice-Consul at Algiers); Consul at Nice.

George Hartley, Vice-Consul for Angola and Dependencies.

George Phillippo; Puisne-Judge of British Guiana.

— 20. Earl de Grey and Ripon; Marquess of Ripon.

Alexander Armstrong, M.D.; K.C.B., Military Division.

Charles Abercromby Anderson, M.D., Richard Denton Mason, David Lloyd Morgan; C.B., Military Division.

William Campbell Maclean, M.D.; C.B., Civil Division.

— 23. Francis Hicks; Knight.

Lord Tenterden; C.B., Civil Division.

Henry Ernest Bulwer, C.M.G.; Governor of Labuan.

— 30. C. J. Herries, Arthur Helps, Henry Reeve, J. Tilley, F. J. Scudamore; C.B., Civil Division.

E. Mengeres; Consul at San José.

July 4. Vice-Chancellor Wickens; Ktd.

— 11. Theodore Walrond, F. Goulburn, and E. B. Malet; C.B., Civil Division.

C. G. Kemball; Puisne Judge of Bombay.

— 14. Lieutenant-Colonel Howard Elphinstone, R.E.; K.C.B., Civil Division.

— 25. William Dougal Christie; C.B., Civil Division.

Hugh Allen of Ravenscrag, Canada; Knight.

Aug. 1. Baron Bloomfield, Ireland; Baron of the United Kingdom.

T. F. Wade (Secretary of Legation in China); Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary and Chief Superintendent of British Trade in China.

— 4. F. P. Smith, J. J. Chalk; Knights. James Paget; Baronet.

Aug. 4. J. J. Peatfield; Consul at Guatemala.

— S. H. S. Tremenheere, Sir F. N. Sandford, H. A. Hunt, A. Power, P. J. Keenan, J. W. Bazalgette, C.B., Civil Division.

The Right Hon. Russell Gurney, M.P.; Commissioner for the settlement of the Alabama Claims.

H. T. A. Ramsal (Consul at Baltimore), Consul at Brest.

— 22. Sir Edward Thornton, K.C.B.; Privy Councillor.

Right Hon. James Stansfeld; President of Local Government Board.

Adam Ranken; Inspector of Schools.

Richard Wallace, of Hertford House; Baronet.

— 29. Hon. J. C. Walter Vivian; Under-Secretary of State to the Right Hon. E. Cardwell.

Sept 1. Right Hon. Lord Chief Justice Cockburn; British Arbitrator in the Alabama Claims.

— 5. Patrick J. Hughes (Consul at Kiu-Kiang); Consul at Hankow.

William Gregory, (Vice-Consul at Tamsuy); Vice-Consul at Canton.

S. Frederick Mayers; Vice-Consul at Kiu-Kiang.

Martin Dolmen; Vice-Consul Councillor at Yeda.

— 8. The Rev. R. W. Church, M.A.; Dean of St. Paul's.

— 15. S. Stepney Cowell-Stepney; Baronet.

William Ward; (Vice-Consul at Memel), Consul-General for Bremen, &c.

— 26. Robert Hamilton Lang; Consul for Cyprus.

Sir Walter Morgan, Knt.; Chief Justice of Madras.

Robert Stuart, Q.C., Chief Justice of the North-West Provinces; Knighted.

Sir Edward Lugard, Earl De la Warr, J. C. O'Dowd; Commissioners under the Regulations of the Forces' Act, 1871.

— 29. Sir A. A. Kennedy, Sir B. C. Pine; Knights Commanders of St. Michael and St. George.

S. Freeling, J. H. Darrell, F. S. Wigley, C. P. Layard; Companions of St. Michael and St. George.

Oct. 6. Thomas Sidgreaves; Chief Justice of the Straits Settlements.

Edward Graham Alston; Queen's Advocate for Sierra Leone.

— 10. Rev. J. B. Mozley, D.D.; Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, and Canon of Christ Church.

— 17. Rt. Hon. Sir Andrew Buchanan (Ambassador to Russia); Ambassador to Austria.

Right Hon. Lord Augustus W. F. S. Loftus (Ambassador to Germany); Ambassador to Russia.

Oct. 17. Odo W. L. Russell; Ambassador to Germany.

— 27. The Ven. H. Willoughby Jermyn; Bishop of Colombo.

— 31. Right Hon. Sir F. Rogers, Bart; Baron Blackford, of Wisdome, county Devon.

Rev. J. C. Miller, D.D.; Canon of Worcester.

William Law, J. H. Parker; C.B., Civil Division.

Nov. 3. Colonel F. J. Goldsmid; Knight Commander of the Star of India.

James Armstrong; Chief Justice of St. Lucia.

— 7. Sir S. S. Willes, Sir Montague E. Smith, Sir Edward Luard, Sir R. P. Collier; Privy Councillors.

Sir J. W. Colville, Sir M. E. Smith; Members of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, under the Act of the preceding Session.

Baron Dufferin (Ireland); Viscount Clondeboyne and Earl of Dufferin in the United Kingdom.

W. H. Stephenson; C.B., Civil Division. Sir R. P. Collier; Puisne Judge of the Common Pleas.

— 10. Sir J. D. Coleridge (Solicitor-General); Attorney-General.

George Jessel, Q.C.; Solicitor-General. Sir H. S. Maine; Member of the Council of India.

— 14. The Dowager Lady Aveland; Baroness Willoughby d'Eresby.

Field-Marshal Sir G. Pollock; Constable of the Tower, and Lieutenant and Custos Rotulorum of the Tower Hamlets.

— 17. Lord Tenterden; Her Majesty's

Agent to attend the Geneva Arbitration on the Alabama Claims.

Nov. 21. T. Graham Briggs, of Barbados; Baronet.

Robert Christison, M.D., of Edinburgh; Baronet.

Denis Donohoe (Consul at New Orleans); Consul at Baltimore.

Albany de G. de Foulblanque (Consul at Carthage); Consul at New Orleans.

William K. Green (Vice-Consul at Tunis); Vice-Consul at Damascus.

C. Louis St. John (Vice-Consul at Christiania); Vice-Consul at Sassy.

Lieutenant-Colonel C. G. Gordon, R.E.; Vice-Consul in the Delta of the Danube.

— 24. Right Hon. Lord Lawrence, Right Hon. A. Brewster, Admiral Sir M. Seymour, Sir F. Arrow, H. C. Rothery, T. Chapman, F.R.S.; Commissioners to inquire into the loss of H.M.S. "Megara."

Sir R. P. Collier; Member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, under the Act of the preceding Session.

Montague Bernard, D.C.L.; Member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, under the Act of the 4th William IV.

— 28. Rev. Alfred Barry, D.D.; Canon of Worcester.

Dec. 1. Hugh Mallet; Consul at Carthage.

William Robert Grove, Q.C.; Puisne Judge of the Common Pleas.

— 8. Sir B. C. C. Pine (Governor of Antigua); Governor of the Leeward Islands.

Edgar L. Layard; Consul for Grand Para, &c.

THE MINISTRY.

THE CABINET.

First Lord of the Treasury, Right Hon. W. Ewart Gladstone.

Lord High Chancellor, Right Hon. Lord Hatherley.

Lord President of the Council, Most Hon. the Marquess of Ripon.

Lord Privy Seal, Right Hon. Viscount Halifax.

Chancellor of the Exchequer, Right Hon. Robert Lowe.

Secretary of State, Home Department, Right Hon. Henry Austin Bruce.

Secretary of State, Foreign Department, Right Hon. Earl Granville.

Secretary of State, Colonial Dep.

Right Hon. Earl of Kimberley.

Secretary of State, War Department, Right Hon. Edw. Cardwell.

Secretary of State, Indian Department, His Grace the Duke of Argyll.

First Lord of the Admiralty, Right Hon. G. Joachim Goschen.

Chief Secretary for Ireland, Most Hon. the Marquess of Hartington.

President, Local Government Board, Right Hon. James Stansfeld.

Vice-President, Committee of Council, Right Hon. William E. Forster.

NOT IN THE CABINET.

Commanding-in-Chief, F.M. H.R.H. Duke of Cambridge.

Chancellor, Duchy of Lancaster, Right Hon. Earl Dufferin.

Works and Public Buildings, Right Hon. Acton Smee Ayrton.

Junior Lords of the Treasury, William Patrick Adam, Marquess of Lansdowne, and William Henry Gladstone.

Joint Secretaries to the Treasury, George Grenfell Glynn and William Edward Baxter

Junior Lords of the Admiralty, Vice-

Admiral Sir S. C. Dacres, Captain Robert Hall, C.B., Rear-Admiral John W. Tarleton, C.B., and Earl of Camperdown.

President, Board of Trade, Right Hon. Chichester P. Fortescue.

Postmaster-General, Right Hon. William Monsell.

Secretary to the Admiralty, G. J. Shaw Lefevre.

Attorney-General, Sir John Duke Coleridge.

Solicitor-General, Sir George Jessel.

SHERIFFS FOR 1871.

ENGLAND.

(Excepting Cornwall and Lancashire.)

BEDFORDSHIRE.—Edward Henry Frederick Dawkins, of Muggenheranger Park, Esq.

BERKSHIRE.—George Charles Cherry, of Denford House, Hungerford, Esq.

BUCKS.—Christopher Tower, of Huntsmoor Park, Esq.

CAMBRIDGESHIRE AND HUNTINGDONSHIRE.—Thomas Richards, of Wimblington, Isle of Ely, Esq.

CHESHIRE.—The Earl of Haddington, of Eaton Bank.

CUMBERLAND.—William Banks, of Highmoor House, Esq.

DERBYSHIRE.—Charles Rowland Palmer Morewood, of Alfreton Park, Esq.

DEVONSHIRE.—Sir Lydston Newman, of Mamhead, Bart.

DORSETSHIRE.—John Tregonwell, of Cranborne Lodge, Esq.

DURHAM.—James Cookson, of Neasham Hall, Esq.

ESSEX.—Robert Gosling, jun., of Hassobury, Farnham, Esq.

GLOUCESTERSHIRE.—William Payne, of Longfords, Minchinhampton, Esq.

HEREFORDSHIRE.—Stephen Robinson, of Lynhales, near Kington, Esq.

HERTFORDSHIRE.—Charles Longman, of Shendish, Hemel Hempsted, Esq.

KENT.—Francis Phillips, of Lee Priory, Ickham, Esq.

LEICESTERSHIRE.—Harry Leicester Powys Keck, of Staughton Grange, Esq.

LINCOLNSHIRE.—John Reeve, of Leadenham, Esq.

MONMOUTHSHIRE.—Thomas Cordes, of Brynglas, near Newport, Esq.

NORFOLK.—Sir Henry Josias Stracey, of Rackheath Park, Bart.

NORTHAMPTONSHIRE.—Sir Geoffrey Palmer, of Carlton, Bart.

NORTHUMBRLAND.—John George Frederick Hope-Wallace, of Featherstone Castle, Esq.

NOTTINGHAMSHIRE.—James Thorpe, of Coddington, Esq.

OXFORDSHIRE.—Sir Algernon William Peyton, of Swift's House, Bart.

RUTLAND.—John Harry Lee Wingfield, of Tickencote, Esq.

SHROPSHIRE.—William Kenyon Slaney, of Hatton Grange, Esq.

SOMERSETSHIRE.—Henry Kornish Henly, of Leigh House, Chard, Esq.

COUNTY OF SOUTHAMPTON.—Henry Compton, of Manor House, Minstead, Esq.

STAFFORDSHIRE.—Charles Walter Lyon, of Silver Hill, Esq.

SUFFOLK.—Thomas Richard Mills, of Great Saxham, Esq.

SURREY.—Money Wigram, of Esher-place, Esq.

SUSSEX.—Walter Wyndham Burrell, of Cuckfield, Esq.

WARWICKSHIRE.—John Thomas Arkwright, of Hatton House, near Warwick, Esq.

WESTMORELAND.—William Henry Wakefield, of Sedgwick, Esq.

WILTSHIRE.—John William Gooch Spicer, of Spy Park, Chippenham, Esq.

WORCESTERSHIRE.—William Hanford Flood, of Woollas Hall, near Pershore, Esq.

YORKSHIRE.—Sir Henry Edwards, of Pye Nest, Bart.

WALES.

NORTH AND SOUTH.

- ANGLESEY.—John Jones, of Tre-anna, Esq., afterwards John Wynne Paynter, of Maes-y-llwyn, Esq.
 BRECONSHIRE.—Thomas John Evans, of Tymawr-yn-y-Glyn, Esq.
 CARDIGANSHIRE.—Sydney Henry Jones Parry, of Tyllwyd, near Newcastle Emlyn, Esq.
 CARMARTHENSHIRE.—William Du Buisson, of Glynhir, Llanelly, Esq.
 CARNARVONSHIRE.—John Griffith Wynn Griffith, of Llanfân, Esq.
 DENBIGHSHIRE.—Samuel Pearce Hope, of Marchwiel Hall, Esq.
 FLINTSHIRE.—Hugh Robert Hughes, of Kimmell, Esq.
 GLAMORGANSHIRE.—Vaughan Hauning Lee, of Lanclay, near Pontypridd, Esq.
 MERIONETHSHIRE.—Charles Edwards, of Dolserau Hall, Esq.
 MONTGOMERYSHIRE.—John Robinson Jones, of Brithdir Hall, Esq.
 PEMBROKESHIRE.—Frederick Leopold Sapieha Manteuffel de Rutzen (commonly called Baron Frederick de Rutzen), of Slebech, Esq.
 RADNORSHIRE.—Sir John James Walsham, of Knill Court, near Walton, Bart.

INDEX.

N.B. The figures between [] refer to Part I.

- ABERDARE, Terrible colliery explosion, 104.
- ABERDEEN, Mr. Gladstone presented with Freedom of City, [105].
- ACCIDENTS.—To a Boat near Wallingford, 78; fall from a cliff, 82; Hunting, 116.
- ACLAND, SIR THOMAS, Obituary notice, 155.
- ADMIRALTY.—Mr. Childers resigns as First Lord; Mr. Goschen appointed First Lord, 314.
- "AGINCOURT," The, Court-martial, 240.
- AGRAHIAN Murder in Meath, 116.
- "ALABAMA" CLAIMS.—Treaty, [4]; Commission meets at Washington, [94]; Chief Justice Cockburn appointed Arbitrator, 315; Mr. Russell Gurney appointed a Commissioner, *ib.*
- ALBERT (ROYAL) HALL, Opened, 38; Society of Arts Concerts at, 41.
- ALDERSHOTT, Royal Review at, 72.
- ALEXANDER, EMPEROR OF RUSSIA, Telegram to Emperor William at Versailles on the Capitulation of Paris, [275].
- ALFORD, DEATH, Obituary notice, 140.
- "ALICE" in Wonderland and Through the Looking-glass, [360].
- ALI PASHA, GRAND VIZIER OF TURKEY, died, [281].
- ALSACE AND LORRAINE, Convention, [212]; Bill for incorporation into Germany before the *Reichstag*, [226].
- ALT KATHOLIKEN, Old Catholic movement, [230]; Congress at Munich, [232].
- AMADEUS, KING OF SPAIN, Enters Madrid on 2nd January, and takes the oath of fidelity to the Constitution, [263]; Brings the Queen on 19th March, [264]; Speech at opening of New Cortes, [265]; Makes a Tour through the Southern and Eastern Provinces, [269]; has an interview with Espartero at Saragossa, [*ib.*]; Returns to Madrid [*ib.*]; Suspends Sessions of Cortes, [270].
- AMERICA, 282; *vide* United States.
- ANDRASSY, COUNT, Hungarian Prime Minister, opposes Home Rule in Bohemia, [248]; Succeeds Count Beust as Minister for Foreign Affairs, [250].
- ANETHAN Ministry in Belgium, its Fall, [272].
- APPELGARTH, MR. A., Obituary notice, [144].
- APPOINTMENTS, Promotions and, 314.
- ARABIA, Cholera in, [306].
- ARGENTINE REPUBLIC, [305].
- ARGYLL, DUKE OF, Speech on Army Bill, [75]; Opens Cooper's Hill College, 80.
- ARMY ESTIMATES issued [31]; Discussion, [59].
- ARMY REFORM, Agitation for, [8]; Speech of Sir W. Mansfield, [18]; Letter of Earl Russell, [20]; Statement of Mr. Muntz, [22]; Speech of Duke of Cambridge at dinner of London Orphan Asylum, 16.
- ARMY REGULATION BILL introduced by Mr. Cardwell, [33]; Mr. Trevelyan's motion, [35]; Debate on second reading, [50]; obstinately resisted by military members, [71]; after four months' discussion the Bill limited to Purchase Clauses and the privileges of Lord Lieutenants, [72], Debate in House of Lords, [*ib.*]; Majority against its passing a second reading till the House had a comprehensive plan before it, [76]; Abolition of Purchase by Royal Warrant, [*ib.*]; Bill passed in the Lords after Vote of Censure on Ministry, [81]; Discussion in Commons, [82]. *Vide* PURCHASE IN THE ARMY.
- ARMY Reorganization and Reform; France, [208]; Russia, [276]; Sweden, [274].
- ART, Retrospect of, [360].
- ARTHUR, PRINCE, Grant of suitable provision to, [88]; Accident to, 55; Demonstration Meeting against Parliamentary provision for, 79; a Privy Councillor, 315.

- ASCOT CUP, won by Mortemer, 61.
 ASIA, [306].
 ASPHALTE pavements, [142]
 ASSI, a member of the "Central Committee" of Paris, his history, [180]; arrested [192].
 ATLANTIC Steaming, 62.
 ATTORNEY-GENERAL, SIR J. D. COLERIDGE appointed, 316.
 AUBER, Obituary notice, 149.
 AUBERON-HERBERT, MR., Speech on Foreign Affairs, [29]; Speech on Army Bill, [53]; Speech in defence of Mr. Fawcett, [67].
 AUERSPERG, PRINCE ADOLF, succeeds Count Kellersperg, as Minister President of Austro-Hungary, [251]; His programme, [*ib.*].
 AUSTRALIAN COLONIES, Efforts towards Federation, [128]; Lord Kimberley's despatch answered, [*ib.*].
 AUSTRO-HUNGARY, History of the year, [243]; Struggle between Centralization and Federalism, [*ib.*]; Sir Andrew Buchanan, to be Ambassador to, 315.
 AYRTON, MR., Unpopularity of, [17].
- BABBAGE, CHARLES, Obituary notice, 159.
 BALLOON from Paris found in Surrey, 13.
 BAILLOT BILL introduced by Mr. Forster, [35]; discussion in Commons, [85]; opposed by a few Conservative members for five or six weeks, [86]; Liberal amendments withdrawn, and the defence of the Bill conducted by Mr. Forster alone, [*ib.*]; Passed in the Commons and rejected in the Lords, [*ib.*].
 BANK HOLIDAYS ACT, 81, 138.
 BANKS, [142].
 BAPAUME, Battle of, [154].
 BASTIAN, DR., work on Spontaneous Generation, [372].
 BAXTER, MR., Secretary of the Treasury, [68].
 BEDFORD, PAUL, Obituary notice, 140.
 BELFORT, Battle of, [159].
 BELFORT, Capitulation of, [168].
 BELGIUM, [271].
 BELL, MATTHEW, Obituary notice, 160.
 BELLEVILLE, after a strong defence, captured, [199]. *Vide* PARIS, REPUBLICANS, RED.
 BENEDETTI, COUNT, publishes his "Case," [233]; triumphant retort of Prince Bismarck, [234].
 BENTLEY, RICHARD, Obituary notice, 157.
 BERGERET, GENERAL, Member of the Commune, recommends sortie from Paris on Versailles, [187]; commands right wing and defeated, [*ib.*]; deprived of post of Commandant of Paris and placed under arrest, [190]; killed at conquest of Paris, [200].
 BERKELEY, Professor Fraser's edition of, [340].
 BERKSHIRE CAMPAIGN, The, and its abandonment, [98].
 BERLIN.—Public rejoicings, [221]; arrival of the Conquerors of France, [*ib.*]; grand military triumph, [229]; Inauguration of equestrian war statue of King Frederick William III. by the Emperor, [229].
 BERNARD, MOUNTAGUE, Member of Judicial Committee of Privy Council, 316.
 BEUST, COUNT, Chancellor of the Austro-Hungarian Empire; opposes home rule in Bohemia, [248]; resigns, [249]; appointed ambassador to England, [250]; meeting with Prince Bismarck at Gastein and Salzburg, [251].
 BILLIARDS, Extraordinary score at St. James's Hall, 9.
 BILSTON, St. Leonard's, Election of an Incumbent, 59.
 BIOGRAPHY, books of, [311].
 BISHOP, The, of Bond Street. Death of Mr. William Bishop, 27.
 BISMARCK, PRINCE, arrives at Berlin, [221]; raised to the rank of prince, [222]; speech in Reichstag on incorporation of Alsace and Lorraine, [226]; goes to Frankfurt and concludes the peace negotiations, [228]; policy against Ultramontanes, [230]; meetings with Count Beust at Gastein, [231]; and Salzburg, [232]; speech on the Convention with France, [235].
 BLACK'S, MR. WILLIAM, "A Daughter of Heth," [357].
 BLACK SEA ARRANGEMENTS, New, [280].
 BLACK SEA CONFERENCE, [4]; history, [5]; results, [17]; speeches of Mr. Disraeli and Mr. Gladstone in Commons, [28]; advantages resulting to Russia from, [276]; first meeting, 10; Protocols, 272; Circular of M. Jules Favre to French Diplomatic Agents abroad, 291.
 BLENKIRON, WILLIAM, Obituary notice, 157.
 BOARD OF TRADE.—Mr. Chichester Fortescue appointed President of, [18].
 BOAT RACE.—Pair-oared match on the Tyne, 9; University, 42; International four-oared at New B. unswick, 88.
 BOHEMIA, Home Rule for, [247].
 BORDEAUX.—Protests against the armistice arranged at Capitulation of Paris, [163]; National Assembly meets at, [169].
 BOULTON AND PARK, The, Trial, 220.
 BOURBAKI, GENERAL, and the East portion of the Army of the Loire, [156];

- expedition to seize the Pass of Belfort and cut off the communications of the enemy with Germany, [158]; defeated after three days' battle at Héricourt, [159]; attempts to commit suicide, [160]; his army becomes interned in Switzerland, [46].
- BOURBON, House of, Repeal by National Assembly (France) of the laws of proscription and banishment, [203].
- BOURGEOIS (Communist) shot, [202].
- BOXING-DAY a Bank Holiday, 138.
- BRAND, MR. H. B. W., Speaker of the House of Commons, [145].
- BRASSEY, THOMAS, Esq., Will proved, 14.
- BRAZIL, [305]; Emperor of, visits Portugal, [271]; Emperor and Empress visit England, 70.
- BRIGHTON.—The Easter Monday Volunteer Review, 45.
- BRITISH ASSOCIATION. — Meeting at Edinburgh, [374].
- BROUGHAM'S, Lord, Autobiography, [321].
- BROWN INSTITUTION or Hospital for Diseases of Quadrupeds and Birds, opened, 180.
- BROWNING'S, MR., "Balaustion" and "Alcestes, after Euripides," [354].
- BRUCE, MR., introduces Trades Unions Bill, [86]; considered most responsible for blunders and misconduct of the Session of Parliament, [94].
- BRUSSELS, Riots at, [272].
- BUCHANAN, SIR ANDREW, to be ambassador to Austria, 315.
- BUDGET introduced by Mr. Lowe, [63]; discussed, [65]; twice altered, [67].
- BUDGET, Indian, introduced by Mr. Grant Duff, [86].
- BUDGET, The German, [240]; Austro-Hungarian, [244, 247]; Italian, [262]; Spanish, [266]; Swedish, [274]; Danish, [285]; United States, [301].
- BUENOS AYRES, Plague at, [305].
- BURGOYNE, SIR JOHN, Funeral of, 114; obituary notice, 160.
- BUSHY PARK, Review at, 70.
- BUXTON, CHARLES, Obituary notice, 156.
- BYNG, HON. FREDERICK, Obituary notice, 153.
- CABINET, The, unpopularity of some members of, [17]; list of, 316.
- CALCUTTA, Murder of Mr. Justice Norman at, 101.
- CAMBRIDGE, DUKE OF, Speech at dinner of London Orphan Asylum on Army Reform, 16.
- CANTERBURY.—Dr. Payne Smith appointed Dean of, 314.
- CARDWELL, MR., introduces Army Regulation Bill, [33]; speech on Second Reading, [56]; speech on Army Estimates, [60].
- CASWALL, REV. HENRY, Obituary notice, 111.
- CATTLE, Importation of Foreign, [113].
- CATTLE MARKET, New Foreign, at Deptford opened, 138.
- CATTLE SHOW OF SMITHFIELD CLUB, 132.
- CAUTLEY, COLONEL SIR PROBY, Obituary notice, 191.
- CECIL, LORD E., Speech on Army Bill, [54].
- CENSUS taken, 43; Results, 66.
- CENSUS, The, Preliminary Report as affecting Parliamentary Boroughs, [136].
- CENSUS of United States, results, [289].
- "CENTRAL COMMITTEE," A mysterious so-called, organizes the Red Republicans of Paris, [175].
- CENTRUMSFRACTION, the party of the Centre in the German Reichstag, [223].
- CENTENARIAN, A, 38, another, 136.
- CESAREWITCH, The, won by Sabinus, 111.
- CHAMBERS, ROBERT and DAVID, Obituary notices, 146.
- CHAMBORD, COUNT DE, Manifesto of, 5th July, [204].
- CHANNEL FLEET at night-quarters, 23.
- CHANZY, GENERAL, and the west portion of the Army of the Loire, [156]; defeated at Le Mans, [157].
- CHATHAM DOCKS, Opening of, 67.
- CHATHAM, Siege operations at, 117.
- CHATTERTON, MR. J. B., Obituary notice, 148.
- CHAUDRY, M., a late writer in the *Sidèle*, shot by the Commune, [198].
- CHESTERFIELD, EARL OF, dies from typhoid fever, 128; obituary notice, 163.
- CHICAGO, FIRE AT, [296]; Mansion House Fund for, 113.
- CHILDERS, MR., retires from the Admiralty, [18], [68]; speech at Pontefract, [145].
- CHINA, Inundations in Tientsin and other places in, [306].
- CHOLERA at Königsberg, [243]; at St. Petersburg, [278]; at Constantinople, [281]; in Arabia, [306].
- CHURCH, REV. R. W., to be Dean of St. Paul's, 315.
- CISSEY, GENERAL, appointed to the command of the south of Paris, [201].
- CLONMEL ASSIZES, [49].
- CLUSERET, GENERAL, Delegate of War under Commune, [185]; reorganizes the National Guard of Paris, [190], dismissed and arrested, [192].
- COBDEN CLUB.—Annual dinner, 69.
- COCKBURN, LORD CHIEF JUSTICE, Pro-

- test against appointment of Sir R. P. Collier as one of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, [121]; to be Arbitrator in the Alalana Claims, 315.
- COINAGE BILL, Imperial, Germany, [238].
- COLFRIDGE, SIR J. D., to be Attorney-General, 316.
- COLLIER, SIR R. P., ATTORNEY-GENERAL, appointed a member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, [121]; 316; protest of Lord Chief Justice Cockburn, *ib.*; correspondence, 133.
- COLONIES, The, [127]; Dinner by gentlemen interested in them, to the Marquis of Normanby, 49.
- COLUMBIA MARKKT transferred to Corporation of the City of London, 121.
- COMÉDIE FRANÇAISE.—The first appearance of the Actors out of Paris, 53; Farewell Banquet to them at Crystal Palace, 72.
- COMING RACE, The, [358].
- COMMERCE, [142].
- COMMERCIAL TREATY (French and English).—Its revision under consideration of the French Ministry, [215].
- COMMUNE at Paris installed, [185]; internal dissension and changes, [192]; programme of April 19, [193]; distrust on every side, [197]; ended, [201] *Vide* PARIS, SECOND SEIGE OF, RED REPUBLICAN PARTY IN PARIS.
- COMMUNISTS' TRIALS at Versailles, [213].
- CONGRESS, United States, met on 4th Jan., [282]; New Congress met on 4th March, [285].
- CONSEILS-GENERALS Elections, [214].
- CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS.—The opposition to them gaining in strength, [133]; report of the Commission, [135]; agitation against, 3.
- COOPER'S-HILL COLLEGE opened by the Duke of Argyll, 80.
- CO-OPERATIVE COMPANIES, NEW, [142].
- COREA, PENINSULA OF, Expedition by the United States against, [298].
- CORRESPONDENCE respecting the pecuniary demands of Prussia on France, 265; between British subjects residing in France and the Foreign Office, 259; upon the Franco-German War, 248.
- CORTES CONSTITUYENTES of the Revolution (Spain) dissolved, [261].
- CORTES LEGISLATIVE (Spain) meets on 3rd April, [264]; King's speech, [265]; Debates, [266]; adjourned, [268]; re-assemblies, [269]; Sessions suspended, [270].
- COURBEVOIE.—Fight between the Communist and Versailles troops, [186].
- COURT-MARTIALS.—The "Ágin-court," 240; the "Megara," 243.
- CRICKET, Death at, 69; Oxford and Cambridge match at Lord's, 70; Eton and Harrow match, 76.
- CROWN PRINCE OF GERMANY reviews Northern Army at Rouen, [175].
- CROWE AND CAVACASHELL, MESSRS., Work on Art, 367.
- CRYSTAL PALACE.—Triennial Handel Festival, 65; Banquet to Actors of Comédie Française, 72; Scottish Fete, 82.
- CUBA continuing in a state of rebellion, [270]; Massacre of young Medical Students at Havannah, [264].
- DAILY NEWS, War Correspondence of the, [310].
- DAKIN, ALDERMAN, Thanks of Court of Common Council of City of London voted, 123.
- DARBOY, ARCHBISHOP OF PARIS, arrested by the Commune, tried by court-martial, condemned, and shot, [199].
- DARK, JAMES, Obituary notice, 161.
- DARWIN'S, MR., "Descent of Man," [368].
- D'ATREILLE DE PALADINES, GENERAL, Commander of National Guard in Paris, [176]; his dismissal demanded by the Red Republicans, [26]; Admiral Sausset appointed in his stead [182].
- DAVISON, MR., JUDGE ADVOCATE-GENERAL, Speech on Army Regulation Bill, [51]; Obituary notice, 118.
- DAVY, FLORA, Trial of, for the Murder of F. G. Moon, 231.
- DEANE, SIR T., Obituary notice, 157.
- DECENTRALIZATION BILL (France), [207].
- DE FRÍAS, DUCHESS, Obituary notice, 112.
- DE GREY, EARL, created Marquis of Ripon, [86]; 315. *Vide* RIPPON, MARQUIS OF. "DELAWARE," Loss of the, 137.
- DE LA WARR, EARL, to be Commissioner under Regulations of the Forces Act, 315.
- DELESCLUSE (Communist), dismissed from office, [192]; appointed Minister of War, [197]; killed at Conquest of Paris, [200].
- DEMOCRACY IN ENGLAND singularly weak, [102].
- DEMOCRATS, ENGLISH, hold a Meeting in Trafalgar-square, first prohibited and then allowed by the police, [103]; Meeting to establish a Republican Club, 38.
- DE MORGAN, PROFESSOR, Obituary notice, 147.
- DENISON, MR., retires from Speakership of House of Commons, [145].
- DENISON, SIR W., Obituary notice, 141.
- DENMARK, [275].
- DENOMINATIONAL SCHOOLS, The clauses

- of the Education Act allowing of aid to, threatening trouble to the Government, [133].
- DELFORD, New Foreign Cattle Market opened at, 138.
- DERBY MEMORIAL SCHOOLS opened, 130.
- DEWBURY, The, won by Favonius, 55.
- DEUTSCH REICHSPARTY, the German Imperial party in the Reichstag, "DEVASTATION," II M S., launched, 75.
- DIALITICAL SOCIETY OF LONDON and Spiritualism, [873].
- DIAMOND ROBBERY, The Great, by the Turpeys, 224.
- DICKENS, CHARLES, Mr. Forster's Biography of, 312.
- DIETS of the separate States of Germany, Meetings of the, 241.
- DILKE, SIR CHARLES, his career, [120]; Speech at Newcastle, [121].
- DISESTABLISHMENT, Mr. Miall's motion for, [92].
- DISRAELI, MR., Speech on Foreign Affairs, [26]; Speech on Black Sea Conference, [28]; Second motion for Dowry to Princess Louise, [38]; Speech on Westmeath Committee, [46]; Speech on Army Bill, [57]; Speech on the Budget, [66]; Speech on Disestablishment, [93].
- DOCK, Opening of New, at Chatham, 67.
- DOLLINGER, DR., excommunicated by the Archbishop of Munich, [230]; Leader of the Old Catholic Movement, [*ib.*]; elected Rector of the University of Munich, [233].
- DOMBROWSKI appointed Commandant of Paris, [190]; drives back 3000 Versailles gendarmes on the 12th of April, and becomes the popular hero, [191], killed at Conquest of Paris, [200].
- DONCASTER RACES, 99.
- "DORKING, Battle of," Imaginary, an article in "Blackwood's Magazine," [107]; referred to in Mr. Gladstone's Speech at Whitby, [108]; literary notice, [308].
- DOUAY, GENERAL, commands a division of Versailles army, 198; enters Paris with his troops, [*ib.*]; appointed to command of the centre of Paris, [201].
- DOUGLAS, MAJOR-GENERAL J., Obituary notice, 150.
- DOUGLAS, GENERAL ROBERT, Obituary notice, 144.
- DOVER, Arrival of Emperor Napoleon at, 30; election riot at, Mr. Jessel re-elected, 128.
- DOWSE, MR., SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR IRELAND, Speech on Westmeath Committee, [46].
- DUBLIN.—Visit of Prince of Wales, Prince Arthur, Princess Louise and Marquis of Lorne, [103]; Fenian amnesty meeting and riots in Phoenix-park, [*ib.*]; another meeting and riots, 97.
- DUCLAIR, Excitement about seizure of vessels at, [1], apologized for by Prince Bismarck, [*ib.*]; inquiry held by Mr. Candlish and Mr. Hudson, 3; correspondence regarding, 235.
- DUNDONALD'S LORD, biography, [320].
- DUNMORAY, Execution scene at, 51.
- DUNRAVEN, LORD, Obituary notice, 161.
- DUPANLOUP, BISHOP, speaks in National Assembly, urging interference on behalf of the Pope's temporal power [206].
- DURAND, SIR HENRY, Obituary notice, 112.
- DUVAL, GENERAL, Member of Commune, recommends sortie from Paris on Versailles, [187]; commands the left column, [188]; defeated, [*ib.*]; taken prisoner and shot by order of General Vinoy, [189].
- EARTHQUAKES in Lancashire and Yorkshire, 28.
- ECCLESIASTICAL TITLES ACT repealed, [88].
- EDINBURGH, Meeting of the British Association at, [374], lady students refused admission to wards of Royal Infirmary by vote of managers, 2.
- EDUCATION, NATIONAL, The School Boards and [132]; aid to denominational schools threatening trouble to Government, [133].
- ELCHO, LORD, Speech on second reading of Army Bill, [52].
- ELCHO SHIELD, entrusted to the keeping of the Corporation of London, 122.
- ELLENBOROUGH, LORD, Obituary notice, 163.
- ELLICOMBE, GENERAL, Obituary notice, 153.
- ELTHAM, The, Murder, 51.
- ENGINEERS' STRIKE at Newcastle settled, 111.
- ENGLAND, History of the year, [1].
- EPHING FOREST, its proper name the Common of Waltham Forest, [91]; Commissioners appointed by Commons to investigate and settle the rights of all concerned, [*ib.*], motion by Mr. Cowper-Temple to preserve the Forest carried against the Government, [*ib.*]; Verderers' Court held, 101.
- "ERIE RING," The, in New York, [293].
- ESCAPE of a Prisoner, Extraordinary, 17.
- ESPARTERO, DUKE DE LA VITTORIA, Interview with King Amadeus, [269].
- ETDES, GENERAL, in command of centre column in sortie from Paris on 3rd April, [188]; driven back, [*ib.*]; repulsed Versailles troops on 11th April at the Southern forts, [191]; killed at conquest of Paris, [200].

- EUGENIE, EMPRESS, New Year's Levée at Chisclhurst, 2; visit her mother in Spain, 99.
- "EUROPA'S SCHOOL, Fight at Dame," 308.
- EXHIBITIONS OF PAINTINGS.—The Ancient Masters [361]; the Royal Academy, *ib.*; Water Colour, the Old Society, [366]; the Institute, [367].
- EXPLOSIONS.—Silkstone mine, near Sheffield, 7; Gun-cotton at Stowmarket, 82; Gunpowder in New Forest, 81; Colliery at Moss Pits, near Wigan, 97; second at ditto, 102; Colliery at Aberdare, 104; Oil-shop at Chelsea, 105; Colliery at Seaham, 118; Boiler in Glasgow, 138.
- FAIDHERBE, GENERAL, and the French Army of the North, [153]; defeated at Bapaume and St. Quentin, [151].
- FANE, JULIAN, Life of, [317].
- FAYRE, M. JULES, chosen plenipotentiary to the Black Sea Conference, [7]; prevented by the Prussians from being present, [8]; conducts negotiations at Versailles for capitulation of Paris, [162]; lays before the Assembly the definitive Treaty of Peace signed at Frankfort, [202]; resigns the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, [207].
- FAWCETT, MR., introduces Bill for opening to all sects the Endowments of Trinity College, Dublin, [88].
- FAWCETT, MRS., Lecture on Woman Suffrage, 23.
- FENIANS, attempts by some, from United States to excite the population of Manitoba, [127].
- FENIAN PRISONERS, departure of five for New York, 5; their reception there, [285]; meeting in Phoenix Park, Dublin, to demand release of those still imprisoned, 80; riot, *ib.*; amnesty meeting and riots in Dublin, 97.
- FERRE, JULES, presides at court-martial on Archbishop Darboy, [199]; lets loose criminals in Paris to kill gendarmes, and sends forth others with petroleum, to spread conflagration, *ib.*; tried and sentenced to death at Versailles, [213]; shot, [214].
- "FIGHT at Dame Europa's School," [308].
- FIRES, at Chicago, [296], 118; in Michigan, Wisconsin, and other North-Western States, [298]; Oil-refining works at Lambeth, 6; Holland House, *ib.*; Holker Hall, 25; Underground Fire at Sheffield, 64; Chemist's shop in Gray's-inn-road, 108; at Leith, 130; at Warwick Castle, 131; Granaries at Rotherhithe, 136.
- FISH, MR. HAMILTON, United States' Foreign Secretary of State, [283].
- reply to Mr. Motley's protest on his recall from the mission to England, *ib.*.
- FLYING SQUADRON sails from Plymouth on a cruise of several months, 3.
- FLOODS at Worcester, 103.
- FLORENS, GU-SAVI, liberated from prison by the Belleville agitators, [152]; issues pamphlet on National Assembly, [168]; recommends sortie from Paris on Versailles, [187]; shot, 1887.
- FOREIGN ACT, Regulation of the, Sir Edward Lugard, Earl de la Warr, and Mr. J. C. O'Dowd to be Commissioners, 315.
- FORD, a fireman, killed at fire in Gray's-inn-road, 108.
- FOREIGN CATTLE MARKET, New, opened at Deptford, 138.
- FORSTER, MR., introduces Ballot Bill [35], conducts it single-handed through the Commons, [86].
- FORTESCUE, MR. CHICHESTER, President of the Board of Trade, [18]; speech on Westmeath Committee, [41].
- FOSCOLO, UGO, his remains exhumed at Chiswick, 60.
- FRANCE.—The situation in, its effect on the English mind, [101]; history of the year, [148]; Military situation at beginning of year, *ib.*; National Assembly elected on 8th Feb., [167]; opened at Bordeaux on 13th Feb., [169]; preliminaries of peace arranged, [171]; accepted by the Assembly, [173]; Evacuation of conquered provinces, [211].
- FRANCE and the Black Sea Conference, Circular to diplomatic agents abroad, [291].
- FRANCE, Public Meeting in London to express sympathy with, 3; Demonstration in Trafalgar-square, 10.
- FRANCIS JOSEPH, Emperor of Austro-Hungary, Meetings with Emperor William at Gastein and Salzburg, [231]; Imperial rescript to the Bohemians, [219]; Speech at opening of Reichsrath on 28th Dec., [253].
- FREDERICK WILLIAM III., King, Inauguration of equestrian war-statue by the Emperor of Germany at Berlin, [229].
- FREDERICK CHARLES, Prince, of Prussia, Commander of Second German Army, defeats General Chanzy at Le Mans, [157].
- FREEMAN'S, MR., Essays, [332].
- FRENCH REPUBLIC, sympathy of the British public with, [3].
- FRENCH Army of the North, [153]; completely broken up, [155].
- FRENCH Deputation to Ireland, 84.
- FROST, Early severe, 126.
- FROUDE, MR., Address on Calvinism, [343].

- GALLIFET, MARQUIS, Commands cavalry brigade, repelling sortie from Paris on 3rd April, [187]; in order of the day announces that no truce or pity would be given to the Communists, [189].
- GAMBETTA, M., expects ultimate success for the French cause, [188]; visits General Chanzy at Laval, and then, proceeding to Lille, advocates resistance to the bitter end, [158]; during armistice, after capitulation of Paris, declares his policy still the same, and acts in opposition to the Government of National Defence, [161]; Decree of Government of National Defence in opposition to him, [163]; resigns the Ministry of War, [163]; elected member of the National Assembly, [206].
- GARIBALDI at Dijon, [161]; elected a member of National Assembly of France, [168]; present at first meeting, when he gave in his resignation, [169]; returns to his island-home of Capriera, [16]; at the request of King Victor Emmanuel, gives his aid to the maintenance of order at Rome on the anniversary of entry of Italian Troops, [258].
- GASPEY, Mr. T., Obituary notice, 164.
- GASTEIN, Interview between the Emperors of Germany and Austria and their Chancellors, [231].
- GEORGE, KING, of Greece, Speech to the Chambers in October, [282].
- GEORGE, MR. JUSTICE, Obituary notice, 164.
- GERMAN CATHOLIC SOCIETIES, Anniversary meeting at Mayence, [282].
- GERMANY.—History of the year, [220]; political parties in, [223]; Mr. Odo Russell to be Ambassador to, 316.
- GERMANY, The Imperial Prince and Princess of, arrive in England, 73. The Prince attends a Review at Aldershot, 16., and the camp at Wimbledon, 73.
- GÉRÔME'S, M., pictures at the Royal Academy's Exhibition, [364].
- GLADSTONE, MR., unpopularity of [18]; Speech on Foreign Affairs, [27]; Speech on Black Sea Conference, [28]; Speech on Foreign Affairs, [31]; Speech on Princess Louise's Dowry, [37]; Speech on Westmeath Committee, [42]; Speech on Army Bill, [58]; Speech on Army Estimates, [59], Announces abolition of purchase in the Army by Royal Warrant, [76]; half adhesion to Mr. Jacob Bright's Female Suffrage Bill, [92]; opposes Mr. Miall's motion for Disestablishment, [94]; presented with freedom of City of Aberdeen, [105]; Speech on "Home Rule," [16.], speech at Whitby, [107]; Speech at Greenwich, [108]; Petition from Greenwich as to his resigning his seat for that borough, 1, Meeting at Greenwich in support of petition ending in vote of confidence, 3.
- GLASGOW.—Lord Shaftesbury in, 90; Fatal Boiler Explosion, 138.
- "GOLIATH," Inspection of the, 108.
- GOODWOOD RACES, 77.
- GOSCHEN, MR., introduces Local Government and Taxation Bill, [62]; succeeds Mr. Childers as First Lord of the Admiralty, [68]; introduces Navy Estimates, [16.]; speech at Mansion House, [16.].
- GRANT, GENERAL, President of the United States, turns his attention to the relations of the United States and Great Britain, [283]; recalls Mr. Motley, [16.]; when Joint High Commission on Fisheries question is proposed by England, suggests that the Commission should decide all matters of dispute between the two Governments, [285]; obtains Mr. Sumner's removal from the Chairmanship of the Senate's Committee on Foreign Relations, [286]; Message to Congress, [300].
- GRANVILLE, EARL, Speech on Army Bill, [75]; announces abolition of purchase in the Army by Royal Warrant, [77]; defends it, [78].
- GREATHED, MR., Obituary notice, 164.
- GREECE [282].
- GREENWICH, Petition from some of the Constituency to Mr. Gladstone to resign his seat for, 1; Meeting called in support of, 5; Mr. Gladstone's speech at, [108].
- GREVY, M., appointed President of National Assembly of France, [169].
- GROTE, MR. GEORGE, Funeral of, 68; Obituary notice, 153.
- GROVE, MR. W. R., Puisne Judge of the Common Pleas, 316.
- GUN-COTTON, Explosion of, at Stowmarket, 82.
- GUNPOWDER Explosion in New Forest, 84.
- GURNEY, MR. RUSSELL, to be Commissioner on "Alabama" Claims, 315.
- HAMILTON, RIGHT HON. GEORGE, Obituary notice, 157.
- HAMPDEN, MR. JOHN, Trial for libel, 124.
- HAMPTON COURT PALACE, Two human skeletons discovered in making excavations, 120.
- HAMPSHIRE, Military Manœuvres in, 92.
- HAMPSTEAD SMALLPOX HOSPITAL, Inquiry into its management, 121.
- HANDEL FESTIVAL, Triennial, at Crystal Palace, 65.
- HARCOURT, MR. VERNON, Speech on

- Royal Warrant for abolition of purchase in the army, [82].
- HARDY, MR. GATHORNE, Speech on Westmeath Committee, [11].
- HARRINGTON, SIR HENRY, Obituary notice, 161.
- HARRINGTON, MARQUIS OF, Secretary for Ireland, [18]; gives notice or motion for Secret Committee of Inquiry into Westmeath, [39], speech, [167].
- HARNESS, REV. W., Literary life of, [311].
- HARROW TERCENTENARY, 62.
- HARTOG, MR. N. E., Obituary notice, 154.
- HAVANNAH, Massacre of some young medical students at, [270].
- HAWTHORNE, MRS. NATHANIEL, Obituary notice, 114.
- HAYLER, SIR GEORGE, Obituary notice, 112.
- HELPS, MR., Thoughts on Government, [311].
- HERICOURT, Battle of, [159].
- HERSCHEL, SIR JOHN, Obituary notice, 150.
- HIGGINS, LIEUT.-GENERAL, Obituary notice, 154.
- HIPPOTAMUS, Birth and death of a baby, at the Zoological Gardens, 21.
- HISTORY, Works on General, [332].
- HOFFMAN, GOVERNOR, of New York, talked of for President of United States at next election, [295].
- HOHENWART, COUNT, appointed Minister-President of Austro-Hungary, [214]; brings before the Reichsrath his Scheme of Reform, [245]; supports "Home Rule" for Bohemia, [247]; resigns, [249].
- HOLKER HALL, Fire at, 25.
- HOLLAND HOUSE, Fire at, 6.
- HOLZGETHEN, BARON, at the head of a Provisional Ministry in Austro-Hungary, [249].
- "HOME RULE," Mr. Gladstone on, [105].
- HOTEL DE VILLE, burnt by the Commune, [201].
- HUDSON, GEORGE, Obituary notice, 161.
- HUMBERT, PRINCE, settles at Rome and sets up a Court on the Quirinal, [255]; accompanies his brother, King Amadeus, on his tour through Spain, [269].
- HUNTING-FIELD, Fatal fall in, 116.
- HUNT'S, MR., "History of Religious Thought in England," [337].
- HURRICANE in the West Indies, 87.
- HUTTON'S, MR. R. H., Essays, [341].
- HUXLEY, PROFESSOR, Speech on University Reform at Manchester, 122.
- HYACINTHE, FATHER, at Munich Congress of Old Catholics, [233].
- HYPOTHEC IN SCOTLAND, Bill for abolition of, introduced and rejected, [61].
- IBNE'S, DR., History of Rome, [333].
- INCOME TAX.—Proposed increase of 10s. 8d. per cent, [63]; owing to withdrawal of other items in Budget, proposed increase of 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ in the pound, [65]; motion by Mr. McCulloch Torrens to limit the increase to 1 $\frac{1}{2}$, defeated, [67]; increase of 2d. proposed and carried, [67].
- INCOME TAX IN FRANCE, M. Thiers' Speech, [219].
- INDIVIDUALISATION OF INVADERS DEPARTMENTS BILL, France, [208].
- INDIANS, RED, Further negotiations of United States' Government with, [299].
- INDIA, BRITISH, [129], the Loob-hais, [16]; the Mus-ulman population, [16]; the Wuhabees, [131]; murder of Chief Justice Norman, [132].
- INDIAN FINANCE.—Committee of House of Commons appointed, [88].
- "INTERNATIONAL," The, Judgment regarding the seizure of, 10.
- INTERNATIONAL BOAT RACE at New Brunswick, 88.
- INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION, opened, 53; closed, 104.
- "INTERNATIONAL WORKING MEN'S ASSOCIATION."—Four members chosen members of the French National Assembly, [168]; its history, [180]; demonstrations at New York, [301].
- INTERNATIONAL YACHT RACES at New York, 115.
- INVERARY, Reception of the Princess Louise, 86.
- IRELAND.—The Meath Election, [17]; the Land Act, [16]; first cases, 2; closing of connexion between Church and State, 1; eviction scene, 51; visit of Prince of Wales, 80; deputation from French Aid Committee, 81; popular demonstrations on Kelly's acquittal. Address by Mr. Justice Lawson on its steadily growing prosperity, 25.
- ITALY.—History of the year, [254].
- JACKSON'S, BISHOP, Primary visitation to St. Paul's, 125.
- JAMES, MR. H., Speech against Female Suffrage Bill, [92].
- JELE, CANON, Obituary notice, 158.
- JEWEL ROBBERY by the Tarpeys, 9.
- JESSELL, MR., re-elected for Dover, 128; to be Solicitor-General, 316.
- JESUITS, The, prohibited from settling in Switzerland, [274].
- JEWISH, a, festival interrupted, 47.
- JOHNSTON, DR. KEITH, Obituary notice, 156.
- JOINT HIGH COMMISSION on fisheries question, &c., suggested to the United States by the British Government,

- [285]; agreed to by the President of the United States, and proposition to comprise all matters of dispute between the two countries, [16]; meets at Washington, 27th Feb., [16]. *Vide* WASHINGTON, TRIUMPH OF.
- JOINT STOCK SPECULATIONS during the year, [111].
- JOURET, M., Delegate of France under Commune; presents his report on 2nd May, 191.
- JOWETT, PROFESSOR, Dinner to at Albion Hotel, 21.
- JUNTS, Who was the author of? By Twistleton and Chebot, [327].
- KATAKAZY, M., Russian Envoy to the United States, sends toast to banquet at New York to British Commissioners of Treaty of Washington, [287], his recall asked for and obtained by the President, [301].
- KELLERSPERG, BARON, succeeds Count Hohenwart as Minister President of Austro-Hungary, [249].
- KELLY, tried and acquitted for the murder of Talbot, 124; report of trial, 235.
- KEMBLE, Mr. Fitzgerald's Lives of the, [315].
- KENMARE, LORD, Obituary notice, 164.
- KINGCOME, ADMIRAL, Obituary notice, 157.
- KING'S LYNN, Thunderstorm, 72.
- KONIGSBERG, Outbreak of cholera at, 243.
- KU-KLUX-KLAN Movement in South Carolina, [292].
- L'ADMIRALTY, GENERAL, encircles Belleville with his forces and captures it, [199]; appointed to command of the north-west of Paris, [201].
- LADY STUDENTS, 2.
- LAGRANGE'S, COUNT, two-year-olds, sale of, 20.
- LAMBETH, Fire at Younghusband's Oil Refining Works, 6.
- LANCASHIRE, Earthquakes in, 28.
- LAND TENURE REFORM ASSOCIATION, Meeting presided over by Mr. J. S. Mill, 54.
- LAND'S END, New Lighthouse at Longships, near, 81.
- LANDSCAPES at the Royal Academy Exhibition, [365].
- LAW, United system of, proposed for the German Empire, [238].
- LE COMTE, GENERAL, attacks the Red Republicans at the Buttes, Montmartre, [177], made prisoner and confined in the Chateau Rouge, [178]; shot, [16].
- LIGHTON'S, MR., "Balaustion," [362].
- LET, REV. C., elected Incumbent of St. Leonard's, Bolton, 59.
- LEIDS, Shock of earthquake at, 29.
- LEIGH, Fire at the pier, 130.
- LE MANS, Battle of, [157].
- LES VERTIERES, Convention of, on 1st February, by which 80,000 French soldiers are "interned" as prisoners in Switzerland, [160].
- LICENSING BILL, Agitation for, [3]; introduced by Mr. Bruce, [61]; public meetings through the country to oppose it, [16]; the Bill abandoned, [62].
- LIBERALE REICHSPARTEI, nicknamed the "mixed pickles," the so-called Liberal-Imperial party in the German Reichstag, [223].
- LINCOLN'S INN, Stealing books from library by a barrister, 7.
- LIGHTHOUSE at Longships, New, 81.
- LIQUOR TRAFFIC AMENDMENT ASSOCIATION, Meetings, 126.
- LITERATURE, Retrospect of, [308].
- LOANS within the year, [110].
- LOCHAR MOSS, Dumfries, A clothed skeleton found, 121.
- LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND TAXATION Bill introduced by Mr. Goschen, [62]; withdrawn, [63].
- LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD, Mr. Stansfeld appointed President, 315.
- LOFTUS, LORD AUGUSTUS, to be Ambassador to Russia, 315.
- LONDON, Lord Mayor's Day, 123.
- LONDON BRIDGE, A leap from, 57.
- LONGWY capitulated, [155].
- LONGYAY, COUNT, succeeds Count Andrássy as Hungarian Prime Minister, [250].
- LOOSHAYS, The, disturbing the Indian frontier, [129].
- LORNE, MARQUIS OF, marriage to Princess Louise, 32; presides at dinner of Scottish Corporation, 129.
- LOYD-LINDSAY, COLONEL, moves resolution on second reading of Army Regulation Bill, [50]; moves amendment against abolition of purchase, [71].
- LOUISE, PRINCESS, The Queen's message relative to her marriage, [37]; discussion on dowry, [37]; not unanimously received by the country, [38]; meeting of working men in London to protest against it, 14; marriage at Windsor, [144], 32; visits Ireland, 80; reception at Inverary, 86; reception at Campbelltown, 102.
- LOUVRE, The, escaped burning by the Commune, [199]; the Library consumed, [201].
- LOWE, MR., introduces the Budget, [63]; reply to Mr. Disraeli's speech, [66].

- LOWELL'S, MR., "My Study Window," [359].
- LUCRAFT, MR., Meeting of London Democrats to celebrate his election as a member of School Board, 2.
- LUGARD, SIR EDWARD, to be Commissioner under the Regulation of the Forces Act, 315.
- LULLIER, LIEUT. CHARLES, entrusted with the command of the National Guard of Paris, [178]; disgraced and imprisoned, [192]; tried and condemned to death at Versailles, [213]; capital sentence commuted, [214].
- LUTZ, HERR VON, Bavarian Minister of Worship, [230]; introduces and carries Bill to prohibit pulpit politics, [237].
- LUXEMBOURG, Diplomatic papers relating to, 268.
- LUXEMBOURG, The, partially blown up by the Commune, [201].
- M-GRATH, MASTER, wins the Waterloo Cup for the third time, 22, death, 138.
- McMAHON, GENERAL, appointed commander of troops for National Assembly, [190]; issues proclamation to soldiery, [192].
- MADRID, Arrival of King Amadeus, [263], arrival of the Queen, [264].
- MAGEE, BISHOP, Address on divisions in the Church of England, [143].
- MAINE, SIR HENRY, Lectures on Jurisprudence, [345].
- MALCAMPO, SENOR, becomes President of Spanish Cabinet, [270]; the Ministry being overthrown, he becomes Minister of Marine in the Sagasta Cabinet, [*ib.*].
- MANCHESTER, Earthquakes at, 28; speech of Professor Huxley at, 122.
- MANITOBA, Territory of, Attempt by Fenian Agitators from United States to excite the population, [127].
- MANN, COLONEL, Obituary notice, 156.
- MANSSELL, DEAN, Obituary notice, 156.
- MANSFIELD, SIR WILLIAM, Speech on the Army Question, [18]; created Baron Sandhurst, [*ib.*]; *vide* SANDHURST, Baron.
- MANTEUFFEL, GENERAL, in command of German forces opposed to French army of the North, [153]; after defeating General Faidherbe at Bapaume, [154], marches towards Belfort, [160]; intercepts General Bourbaki's retreat, [*ib.*].
- MARIO, SIGNOR, Final appearance on the stage of, 76.
- MARRIAGE OF A GIANT AND GIANTESSE, 63.
- MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL, passed by the Commons, [91]; thrown out by the Lords, [92]; indignation meeting at its rejection by the House of Lords, 43.
- MARRIOTT, REV. W. B., Obituary notice, 161.
- MATCH TAX, The, proposed, [63]; provisions of the Bill, [65]; withdrawn, [*ib.*].
- MATCHMAKERS, procession of, as demonstration against proposed match tax, [65], 49.
- MAY, SIR T. E., to be Under Clerk of the Parliaments, 314.
- MAYENCE, Anniversary meeting of German Catholic Societies at [232].
- MAYNE, SIR RICHARD, Monument unveiled, 13.
- MAYO, DR., Obituary notice, 143.
- MEATH, Agrarian murder in, 116.
- MEATH, The, Election, [17].
- MICKLENBURGH, DUKE OF, in command of portion of second German army at Chartres, [156]; at battle of Le Mans, [157]; enters Alençon, [158]; reaches Rouen, [161].
- "MEGERA," loss of, [88], 96; discussion in Commons, [89]; court martial, 213.
- MELVILLE, CANON, Obituary notice, 145.
- MEZIERES capitulated, [153].
- MIALL, MR., Motion for Disestablishment of English Church, [92].
- MICHELIS, PROFESSOR, at the Congress of Old Catholics at Munich, [233].
- MIDDLE PARK PLATE won by Prince Charles, 111.
- "MIDDLEMARCH," by George Eliot, [358].
- MILITARY MANŒUVRES IN HAMPSHIRE, [111], 92.
- MILL, MR. J. S., on Woman's Suffrage, 8; presides at the Land Tenure Reform Association, 54.
- MILLAIS, MR., Picture of Moses, [361].
- MILLER, HUGH, Life and Letters of, [318].
- MILLES, LIEUT.-COLONEL, Obituary notice, 154.
- MILLIERE, Deputy to National Assembly, (Communist) captured and shot, [200].
- MILLIONAIRE, A, Thomas Brassey, Esq., 14.
- MINISTRY, The, 316.
- MINING OPERATIONS, [141].
- MOLTKE, COUNT, Director of the German Campaign, [150], alarmed at the expedition of General Bourbaki to Belfort [159]; arrives at Berlin, [221]; made a Field Marshal, [222].
- MONAHAN, Chief Justice, Charge to Grand Jury of Westmeath, [48].
- MONEY MARKET at opening of year, [2]; during the year, [139].
- MONFANG, BISHOP, Opening harangue at Anniversary of German Catholic Societies at Mayence, [232].
- MONSELL, MR., Postmaster-General, [18], 314.

- MONT CENIS RAILWAY TUNNEL OPENED, [258].
- MONTGOMERY, MR. WALTER, Suicide of, 96.
- MONMARTRE, The Red Republicans establish a park of cannon at, [176]; attempt at capture repulsed, [177].
- MONTPLAISIR, DUKE DE, recalled from exile, [266].
- MOON, SIR FRANCIS, Obituary notice, 161.
- MORMONS, Proceedings by United States Government against, [295].
- MORRIS, SIR EDWARD, Obituary notice, 161.
- MORTIMER, DR, Obituary notice, 158.
- MOT D'ORDRE, M. Henri Rochefort's Journal no longer deigned to appear [195]; quotations from, [197].
- MOTLEY, MR., Debate in the Senate as to his recall from England, [283].
- MUNDELLA, MR., Motion for reduction of Army Estimates, [59]; attempts to arbitrate in Newcastle Engineer Strike, [125].
- MUNICH, Congress of Old Catholics at, [232]; Dr. Dollinger elected Rector of the University, [233].
- MUNRO, ALEXANDER, Obituary notice, 143.
- MUNTZ, MR., Statement on abolition of purchase system, [22].
- MURCHISON, SIR RODERICK, Obituary notice, 162.
- MURPHY, the Anti-Popery Lecturer, assaulted at Whitehaven, 49.
- MUSSULMAN POPULATION OF INDIA, its disposition towards the Government, [129].
- NAPOLÉON, EMPEROR, protests against declarations of National Assembly excluding his house, [174]; arrival at Dover, 30; visited at Chislehurst by the Queen, 44; birthday celebrations, 84; visits Torquay, 99; returns to Chislehurst, 115.
- NATIONAL ARTILLERY ASSOCIATION, Annual Meeting at Shoeburyness, 83.
- NATIONAL ASSEMBLY (France) elected [167]; meets at Bordeaux, M. Grévy appointed President, [169]; chooses M. Thiers as head of the Executive Administration, [16.]; appoints Commissioners to confer with the negotiators for peace, and suspends its sittings, [170]; M. Thiers and his colleagues report the preliminaries of peace, [172]; after discussion accepted, [173]; Versailles selected as centre of legislation and Government, [179]; first meeting at Versailles, [183]; their attitude to the Red Republicans who had organized the Revolution of March 18 182]; having voted the right of each city to choose its own Mayor, on M. Thiers interference revokes it, except as to towns of more than 20,000 inhabitants, [196]; having conquered Paris and the Commune, left the only constituted power in France, [202]; its political character, [203]; supplementary elections, [205], adjourned on the 17th of September, [212]; reassembles on the 4th of December, [215]; President's Message, [21.]; Orleans Princes take their seats, [217]; incident *Ordinaire*, [21.]; incident *Rane*, [218].
- NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION, Annual Meeting at Wimbledon, 73.
- NAVY ESTIMATES issued, [32]; introduced by Mr. Goschen, [68].
- NETHERLANDS, [272].
- NEWCASTLE, Engineers strike at, [125], 111.
- "NEW DEPARTURE" doctrines of democratic party in United States, [292].
- NEWSPAPER ENTERPRISE, the *Times*, 25.
- NEW YORK—Banquet to British members of the Joint High Commission, [287]; riot at Orange processions, [292], the "Tammany ring" and the "Erie ring," [21.].
- "Nihilist" trials in Russia, [276].
- NINE HOURS' MOVEMENT LEAGUE.—Success of the engineers at Newcastle, 112; agitation throughout the kingdom, 113; first General Meeting of Trade Council, 128.
- NORMAN, SIR CHARLES, Chief Justice of Calcutta, murdered, [132]; obituary notice, 158.
- NORMANBY, MARQUIS of, dinner to, on his appointment as Governor of Queensland, 49.
- NORTHBROOK, LORD, opens debate in Lords' on Army Bill, [72]; lays on the table the Royal Warrant for the abolition of purchase in the Army, [77].
- NORWICH, judgment on election petition, 8.
- NOVELS of the year, [357].
- OAKS, The, won by Hannah, 56.
- OBITUARY OF EMINENT PERSONS, 140.
- "OCEANIC," Remarkable run from New York to Liverpool of the, 62.
- O'DOWD, J. C., to be Commissioner under the Regulation of the Forces Act, 315.
- OGILVY, CAPTAIN, Obituary notice, 148.
- OLD CATHOLICS, meeting at Solothurn, Switzerland, [273]; sentiment tending towards the union with the Russian

- Church, [277]. *Vide* ALT KATHOLIKEN.
- OMER PASHA, Obituary notice, 149.
- ORANGE PROCESSIONS at New York, riot and loss of life, 293.
- ORLÉANS PRINCE, elected members of National Assembly, [167]; hold court at Chantilly, [215]; take their seats in the National Assembly, [217].
- OSBORNE, MR., Speech on Westmeath Committee, [45]; Speech on Army Bill, [53]; Speech on the Budget, [67].
- OSCAR, Prince of Sweden, lays the foundation-stone of a new Scandinavian Church at Rotherhithe, 78.
- OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE BOAT RACE, 42.
- OUTRAM, SIR JAMES, memorial unveiled, 85.
- PAINTINGS destroyed by the fire at Holker Hall, 27.
- PAKINGTON, SIR J., Speech on Army Bill, [53].
- PALGRAVE, MR. F. T., Lyrical Poems, [356].
- PALAIS ROYAL, PARIS, A portion burnt by the Commune, [201].
- PALMER, SIR ROXBELL, Letter on Royal Warrant for abolition of purchase in the Army, [83].
- PAN-SLAVISM, under the headship of Russia a favourite cry with revolutionary spirits, [278]; Extract article in "St. Petersburg Gazette" on the question, [*ib.*].
- PARIS, Diary of a besieged resident in, [310].
- PARIS, Correspondence between Lord Lyons and the British residents in, 270.
- PARIS MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS, [207].
- PARIS, MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF, MM. Léon Say and Vautrain a deputation to the City of London from, 115.
- PARIS besieged and bombarded, [118]; New Year's Day, [149]; Forts Nogent, Rosny, and Noisy silenced, [150]; sortie on 13th Jan., [151]; sortie on 18th Jan. the supreme effort of the defence, [*ib.*]; proved a failure, [152]; disaffection at Belleville, [*ib.*]; General Trochu resigns his military command to General Vinoy, [*ib.*]; the *émeute* of the 22nd Jan. stifled, [161]; owing to provisions getting exhausted, capitulation decided on, and negotiations for an armistice completed on 28th Jan., [162]; rations sent in by the Germans, and large consignments of provisions despatched from London, [163]; proclamation issued by Government, explaining their reasons for capitulation, [165]; armistice extended, [170]; dissatisfaction at the Convention for the German partial occupation, [171]; peace signed, [*ib.*]; entry of German troops, [171]; their departure, [175].
- PARIS.—Second Siege of, 1871, night at Courbevoie, [*ib.*]; great sortie on the 3rd April, 1871; ending in complete failure, [188]; proclamation by Commune threatening reprisals, [189]; progress of siege by Versailles troops, [191]; attempts at mediation, [195]; Versailles troops enter on 21st May, [198]; the Communists set fire to principal buildings, [*ib.*]; shoot the hostages, [199]; Belleville captured, [*ib.*]; last struggle at Père la Chaise, [200]. *Vide* COMMUNE, REPUBLICANS, &c.
- PARLIAMENT opened by the Queen, [22]; her Speech read by the Lord Chancellor, [*ib.*]; debates on the Address, [26].
- PATTEN, COLONEL W., Speech on Westmeath Committee, [12].
- PATTERSON, BISHOP, Murder of, 128; Obituary notice, 158.
- PAULET, LORD FREDERICK, Obituary notice, 143.
- PEACE SOCIETY meets at Lausanne in September, [272].
- PEDRO, EMPEROR OF BRAZIL, visits Europe, [305].
- PEEL, SIR ROBERT, Speech on Foreign affairs, [30]; speech on Westmeath Committee, [12].
- PENNEHORN, SIR JAMES, Obituary notice, 159.
- PENTRE PIT, Explosion at, 24.
- PÈRE DECHESNE, organ of Demagogues in Paris during Commune, permitted to live, [195].
- PÈRE LA CHAISE.—The scene of the last struggle of the Commune, [200].
- PÉRONNE capitulated, [151].
- PERSIA, Famine in, [306].
- PHILLIMORE, SIR R. J., to be Judge-Advocate General *ad interim*, 315.
- "PHYSICAL FORCE," Mr. Crookes on, [373].
- PIGEON SHOOTING, Lords and Commoners Match at Hurlingham, 65.
- PLATO, Mr. Jowett's edition of, [338].
- PLURALISM, A, 20.
- PLYMOUTH, Election of a Conservative member, [100].
- POETRY, Books of, [353].
- POLLARD-URQUHART, MR., Obituary notice, 154.
- POLLOCK, SIR GEORGE.—Installation as Constable of the Tower, 137; appointment, 316.
- PONDICHERRY, the rumoured Cession of, contradicted, [4].
- PONTABLER, Battle at, [160].

- POOK, EDMUND, Trial of, for the Murder of Jane Maria Clousen, 229.
- PON, The, holds Court at the Vatican, [255]; Law of Guarantee of Italian Parliament, [*ib.*]; celebrates his Jubilee on 16th June, [256]; "Allocution," [259]; speech on 27th Nov., [261].
- POPE'S CORRESPONDENCE, edited by Elwin, [331].
- PORTUGAL, [271].
- POSTMASTER-GENERAL, Mr. Monsell appointed, 314.
- POTOCKI, COUNT, Minister-President of Austro-Hungary, resignation accepted, [244].
- POTTER, CIPRIANI, Obituary notice, 159.
- POTTER, MR. SECONDARY, Obituary notice, 152.
- POUYER-QUERTIER, M., Finance Minister of France, signs Treaty of Peace at Frankfurt, [202]; propositions in Committee of the Budget, [205]; rejected, and a reformed financial scheme promised, [206]; discussed, [211], presents financial statement to Assembly, [218].
- POYNTER, CAPTAIN, Action for 10,000*l.* damages against Mr. J. G. V. Porter for Assault, 11.
- PRIVY COUNCIL JUDICIAL COMMITTEE BILL introduced by Lord Chancellor, and passed, [100]; the appointments under the Act, [124].
- PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS, 314.
- PROVISIONS, Importation of, [143].
- PRUSSIAN HOUSE OF DEPUTIES, Speech of the Emperor at opening [241].
- PUBLIC DOCUMENTS AND STATE PAPERS, 246.
- PUBLIC SECURITIES, [142].
- PULPIT Politics in Germany, Bill to prohibit, introduced by Von Lutz, the Bavarian Minister, and passed, [237].
- "PUNCH" discussed at Dover Young Men's Christian Association, 27.
- PURCHAS, REV. MR., 24; Report of trial, 187.
- PURCHASE IN THE ARMY.—History, [69]; Debates in Parliament, [71]; abolished by Royal Warrant, [76]; text of Royal Warrant, 304.
- PYAT, FELIX, Member of Committee of Safety, Paris, [192].
- QUEEN, The, opens Parliament, [22]; Letter to the people on the Recovery of the Prince of Wales, [147]; at the marriage of the Princess Louise, 32; opens the Royal Albert Hall, 38; visits the Emperor Napoleon, 44; opens St. Thomas's Hospital, 67; reviews the household troops at Bushy Park, 70; returns to Windsor, 127, visits the Prince of Wales at Sandringham, *ib.*; hurries there again on the Prince's relapse, 134.
- "QUEEN OF THE THAMES," Wreck of the, 30.
- QUEEN VICTORIA STREET opened, 122.
- RACES, The Two Thousand Guineas, 51; The Derby, 55; The Oaks, 56; Ascot Cup day, 61; Goodwood, 77; Doncaster, 99; 2nd October Newmarket Meeting, 111.
- RAILWAYS, [141].
- RAILWAY, North British, Accident at Ferry Hill, 115; London and North Western, Accident at Wigan, to Scotch Express, 127; Manchester, Sheffield and Lincolnshire, Accident near Wortley Station, 186.
- RAILWAY SERVANTS, Movement for Shorter working Hours, Meeting at Manchester, 123; Meeting at Southwark, 134; Formation of Amalgamated Society, *ib.*
- RAMSAY, ADMIRAL, Obituary notice, 165.
- RANC, one of the Members of the Commune of Paris, resigns, [192].
- "RANGOON," Wreck of the, 119.
- READING New Grammar School opened by Lord Chancellor Wood, 99.
- RED RIVER SETTLEMENT, *vide* MANITOBA.
- REICHSRATH, Austro-Hungarian, meets on 20th February, [244]; Dissolved, [247]; Meeting on 27th December, [252].
- REICHSTAG, Parliament of United Germany, Elections for, [222]; First meeting on 21st March, and opening Speech of the Emperor, [231]; Reassembles at Berlin on 16th October, [234]; Emperor's Speech, *ib.*
- RENFORTH, JAMES, Sudden death at International Boat Race, at New Brunswick, 88.
- "REPRESENTATION AND ROYALTY," A Lecture at Newcastle by Sir Charles Dilke, [121].
- REPUBLICAN Club in London, meeting of London Democrats to establish, 88.
- REPUBLICANS, LONDON RED, meeting at Clerkenwell-green, 45; Demonstration in Hyde Park, 47.
- REPUBLICAN, RED, PARTY IN PARIS, Belleville, its stronghold, [149]; dissatisfaction at failure of sortie of 19th January, rescue of Plourens from the prison of Mazas and attack on the Hotel de Ville, [152]; their exasperation at the Germans being allowed to partially occupy Paris, [171]; Organization by a so-called "Central Committee," [175];

- appropriate cannon and mitrailleuses, and fortify Montmartre, [176]; refuse to deliver up their cannon, [177]; Attempt by the Government to carry off the cannon defeated, [*ib.*]; the streets barricaded, and Generals Thomas and Le Comte shot, [178]; Descent from Montmartre and seizure of Hotel de Ville, [179]; Proclamation of Central Committee for Communal Elections, [*ib.*]; Massacre of the Place Vendôme, [183]; Elections on 26th March, [184]; Installation of the Commune, [185]. *TUDE COMMUNE.*
- REPUBLICANISM, A new development of, by Sir Charles Dilke, [120]; not sympathized with by the lower classes, [122].
- RETROSPECT OF LITERATURE, ART, AND SCIENCE, [308].
- RICHMOND, DUKE OF, Speech in Lords on Army Bill, [73]; Motion against the Army Bill passing a second reading till the House had a comprehensive Plan before it, [76]; Moves Vote of Censure on the Ministry, [77.]
- RIPON, MARQUIS OF, takes charge of Ballot Bill in House of Lords, [86]; Member of Joint High Commission at Washington, [285]; Speech at Banquet at New York to British Commission of Treaty of Washington, [287]
- RIVET, M., Propositions in National Assembly, [210]
- ROBERTSON, T. W., Obituary notice, 145.
- ROBINSON, SIR SPENCER, Dismissed from Admiralty, [69]; Correspondence regarding, [*ib.*]
- ROCHEFORT, HENRI, quits Paris in disguise, and falls into the hands of the Versaillesists, [195]; Tried and sentenced to transportation for life, [214].
- ROCK, DR., Obituary notice, 163.
- ROCKROU surrendered, [153].
- ROLT, SIR JOHN, Obituary notice, 155.
- ROME, Rival Courts at, [255]; The Capital of Italy transferred to, [257]; Visit of the King, [*ib.*]; Celebration of anniversary of entry of the Italian Army, [258]; First Italian parliament meets at, [260].
- ROSSEL, LOUIS NATHANIEL, Aide-de-camp to General Cluseret, [190]; Succeeds him as Minister of War, [192]; attempts to reorganize the National Guards, [196]; establishes different commands, [*ib.*]; resigns, [*ib.*]; Trial at Versailles and condemnation to death, [213]; Shot, [214].
- ROTHERHITHE, the foundation stone of a new Scandinavian Church laid, 78; Fire in granaries at, 137.
- ROTHSCHILD, BARON Winner of the Derby, 55; the Oaks, 56; the St. Leger, 100.
- ROMANIAN FACTIONS, [281].
- ROMANIAN RAILWAY BONDS, their repudiation the subject of discussion between Prince Bismarck and Count Beust at Gastein, [231]; Convention acknowledging the Roumanian obligations agreed to by the Government, [251].
- ROYAL ACADEMY EXHIBITION, [361].
- ROYAL WARRANT for Abolition of Purchase, Text of, 331.
- RUSSELL, SIR JOSEPH, Obituary notice, 155.
- RUSSELL, EARL, Letter on Army Reform, [20].
- RUSSELL, MR. ODO, Ambassador to Germany, 316.
- RUSSELL, MR. SCOTT, and his New Social Movement, [118].
- RUSSIA, [275]; Lord Augustus Loftus, to be Ambassador to, 315.
- RYES, Mrs., Obituary notice, 165.
- SAGASTA, SEÑOR, becomes President of the Spanish Cabinet, [270].
- ST. DOMINGO—Commission of Enquiry as to its Annexation to the United States, [283]
- ST. GEORGE'S DAY at St. Peter-burg, [278].
- ST. LEGER, The, won by Hannah, 100.
- ST. PAUL'S ISLAND, H.M.S. "Megera" runs ashore, 96.
- ST. PETERSBURG.—Celebration of St. George's Day, [278]; Outbreak of cholera, [*ib.*].
- ST. QUENTIN, Battle of, [154].
- ST. THOMAS' HOSPITAL, Opening of new, 67.
- SAISSSET, ADMIRAL, appointed Commander of National Guard of Paris, [182]; issues proclamations, [181]; retires to Versailles, [*ib.*].
- SALA, MR. G. A., Action for libelling, 18.
- SALISBURY, MARQUIS OF, Speech on Army Bill, [75].
- SALZBURG.—Interview between the Emperors of Germany and Austria and new Chancellors, [231, 232].
- SANDHURST, BARON, Speech at Westminster Hall, [18]; Speech on Army Bill, [73].
- SARAGOSSA, Interview between King Amadeus and Espartero at [269].
- SAY, M. LÉON, Prefect of the Seine, at the Mansion House, 114.
- SCANDINAVIAN CHURCH, New, in Rotherhithe, laying of the foundation stone, 78.

- SCARBOROUGH, Visit of the Prince and Princess of Wales, 127.
- SCARLETT, GENERAL SIR JAMES Y., Obituary notice, 165.
- SCHENCK, GENERAL, accepts Mission of United States to England, [283]; arrival in England, 58.
- SCHAMYL, the Circassian Chief, Obituary notice, 149.
- SCIENCE, Retrospect of, [368].
- SCOTLAND—Education Bill introduced and dropped, [61].
- SCOTT, SIR WALTER, Centenary celebrations, 81.
- SCOTTISH CORPORATION DINNER, 129.
- SCOTTISH UNIVERSITIES.—Election of Lord Rectors, 124.
- SCULLY, MR. VINCENT, Obituary notice, 155.
- SEAHAM, Colliery explosion at, 118.
- SEEMANN, DR., Obituary notice, 162.
- SELLA, SIGNOR QUINTINO, Finance Minister of Italy, [262].
- SERRANO, MARSHAL, formally resigns the Regency of Spain, [263], becomes President of the Cabinet, [266], resigns, [267].
- "SEVEN POINTS," The, and new Social Movement, [116].
- SHAFTESBURY, Life of the first Lord, [326].
- SHAFTESBURY, LORD, in Glasgow, 90.
- SHAW, SIR CHARLES, Obituary notice, 147.
- SHEFFIELD, Colliery explosion near, 7; underground fire at, 64.
- SHEIL, MAJOR-GENERAL SIR J., Obituary notice, 149.
- SHERIFFS for 1871, 317.
- SHIPWRECKS.—The "Queen of the Thames, 30; the "Megara," the "Underley," 102; the "Three Sisters," 103; the "Rangoon," 119; the "Norfolk Hero," 131; the "Delaware," 136.
- SHOEBURYNESSE, Annual Meeting of the National Artillery Association at, 83.
- SIEGE OPERATIONS at CHATHAM, 117.
- SILKSTONE MINE EXPLOSION, 7.
- SLAVERY.—An Act passed by Brazilian Chambers to abolish it entirely throughout the Empire, [305].
- SMALL-POX—Epidemic in London, [22]; prevalent in Paris, [149].
- SMALL-POX HOSPITAL at HAMPSTEAD.—Inquiry into its management, 121.
- SMITH, REV. R. PAYNE, D.D., to be Dean of Canterbury, 314.
- SMITH, MR. W. H., carries resolution as to leasing land beside Thames Embankment to Board of Works [91].
- SMITH, BISHOP, Obituary notice, 165.
- SMITH, JOHN ABEL, Obituary notice, 143.
- SMITHFIELD CLUB CATTLE SHOW, 132.
- SMYTH, MR. P. J., promotes meeting in Phoenix Park, Dublin, for liberation of Fenian prisoners, [103]; meeting dispersed, and riot, [26.]; Address to people of Ireland after meeting, [26.].
- "SOCIAL ALLIANCE, NEW," movement of Mr Scott Russell, 118.
- "SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC UNION" in Germany convenes meeting of working men at Berlin, [242].
- SOCIAL SCIENCE CONGRESS, Meeting at Leeds, 105.
- SOLICITOR-GENERAL, Mr. Jessel appointed, 316.
- SOLLY, DR., Obituary notice, 159.
- SPAIN.—History of the year, [263].
- SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.—Mr. Denison's retirement, Mr. Brand's election, [145].
- SPIRITUALISTIC Phenomena tested, [373].
- SPITZBERGEN.—Project for its annexation by Sweden objected to by Russia, [274].
- STANSFELD, MR., President of the Poor Law Board, [68]; President of Local Government Board, 315.
- STEPHEN'S, MR. LESLIE, "Playground of Europe," [350].
- STEPHENS, MISS C. E., "The Service of the Poor," [346].
- STERLING, SIR ANTHONY, Obituary notice, 147.
- STORKS, SIR HENRY, Speech on Army Bill, [53].
- STOWMARKET, Explosion of gun-cotton at, 82.
- STRIKES, 134; prevalent, [125]; 9050 engineers at Newcastle, [26.], of telegraph clerks, [126]; among workmen in Germany, [241].
- SUCCESSION DUTIES, Increase of, proposed, [63]; withdrawn, [65].
- SUFFRAGE, FEMALE, Bill introduced by Mr. Jacob Bright, but defeated, half adhered to by Mr. Gladstone, [92].
- SUMNER, MR., opposes President Grant in desire for annexation of St. Domingo, [283]; at head of the Republicans in the United States Senate, [285] removed from the chairmanship of the Committee on Foreign Relations, [286]; speeches in Senate on his removal and the Washington Treaty, [26.].
- SUN, The, outcome, 17.
- SURREY, EAST.—Election of Mr Watney, [100].
- SWEDEN, [274].
- SWEDEN, PRINCE OSCAR OF, lays the foundation stone of a new Scandinavian Church at Rotherhithe, 78.
- SWEDEN, QUEEN OF, Obituary notice, 146.
- SWINBURNE'S, MR., "Songs before Sunrise," [354].

- SWITZERLAND.—30,000 French soldiers "interned" as prisoners, [160]; [272].
- SYMONDS, DR., Obituary notice, 164.
- TAIT, ARCHBISHOP, Letter on Purchas Judgment, [113].
- TALBOT, CONSTABLE, assassinated, 76; trial and acquittal of Kelly for Murder, 124.
- "TAMMANY RING," The New York, [293]; its total defeat, [295].
- TARPLY, MARTHA, Trial of, for Diamond Robbery, 224.
- TARPEY, MICHAEL, Trial of, for Diamond Robbery, 223.
- TELEGRAPHIC ASSOCIATIONS for the protection of Employés, [126]; disapproved of by the Post Office authorities, 134.
- TELEGRAPH CLERKS, Strike of, [126].
- TENNISON'S, MR., new Idyll of the King, [353].
- THAMES EMBANKMENT, Inquiry into rights of Crown to land lying beside the Western portions, [91]; motion of Mr. W. H. Smith adopted, [*ib.*].
- THIERS, M., returned to National Assembly from twenty departments, [168]; chosen head of Executive Administration, [169]; his private house demolished, and his Art Collections confiscated by order of the Commune, [195]; financial statements, [205]; proposes a national loan, [*ib.*], opposes interference on behalf of Pope's temporal power, [206]; his position, [210]; elected President of the French Republic, [211].
- THOMAS, GENERAL, shot by Red Republicans of Paris, [178].
- THOMPSON, SIR W., President of the British Association, [374]; Speech at opening, [*ib.*].
- THUNDERSTORMS, 64, 72, 86.
- TICHBORNE TRIAL, [144]; Report, 210.
- TILLET, MR., unseated for Norwich, 8.
- TINNEY, MR., Obituary Notice, 163.
- TORRENS, MR. McCULLAGH, Motion for limiting increase of Income Tax to one penny, [67].
- TRADE DURING THE YEAR, [141].
- TRADE IN THE UNITED STATES.—Extract from Article by Mr. Wells in *North American Review*, [289].
- TRADE COUNCIL, First general meeting, 128.
- TRADES UNION BILL introduced by Mr. Bruce, [36]; passed, [88].
- TRAFALGAR SQUARE.—Demonstration Meeting in favour of France, 10, Demonstration Meeting against endowment to Prince Arthur, 79; Meeting congratulating the engineers of Newcastle on the result of their strike, 11 2.
- TRAVELS, Books of, [348].
- TREVELYAN, MR. GEORGE, agitates abolition of purchase, [3]; Speech Introduction of Army Regulations and resolutions on Army Administration, [35]; reply to attacks on speeches on Army Bill, [53].
- TRIALS, REMARKABLE, 166.
- TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN, Banned by Mr. Fawcett and dissolved, 88.
- TROCHT, GENERAL, Governor of during the siege, [150]; se paralyzed by the difficulties of position, [*ib.*]; directs the sortie of 14 in person, [151]; resigns his command, [152].
- TUILERIES, The Palace of the, burnt by the Commune, [199].
- TURIN, Rejoicings at, on opening Cenis Railway tunnel, [258].
- TURKEY, [280].
- TYNDAL'S, PROFESSOR, "Hours close on the Alps," [349].
- ULTRAMONTANES, Prince Bismarckishes their influence on the Worship and Education Department Prussia, [230].
- "UNDERLEY," Shipwreck of the Bonchurch, 102.
- UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, [25].
- UNIVERSITY TESTS BILL, Rented and carried, [87].
- UNIVERSITY BOAT RACE, 12.
- URBAIN, one of the Members Commune, tried at Versailles, [1].
- VALENTIN, GENERAL, appointed of Police in France, [177].
- VAMBERY, M. ARMINIUS, on the Famine, [306].
- VAUTRAIN, M., President of the Municipal Council of Paris, at the Mansions 115.
- VENDÔME, PLACE, Massacre of the Column in, destroyed, [195].
- VERNER, BART., SIR W., Obituary 144.
- VERSAILLES, New Year's Day at Peace negotiations at, [171] Prussian head-quarters broken [175], Selected by the National Assembly for the centre of legislative government, [176]; the *Journel* removed to, [179]; first of the National Assembly at, concentration of troops at, [186]—munist Trials at, [213].
- VICTOR EMMANUEL, KING, arrived Rome. [257]; Speech at opening

- first Italian Parliament at Rome on 27th November, [260].
- VINCE, GENERAL, leads a corps at the sortie from Paris of 19th Jan., [151]; succeeds General Trochu in the military command of the city, [152]; Governor of Paris, [161]; in command of Versaille's troops at second siege of Paris, [191]; appointed to the command of the east of Paris, [201].
- VITET, M., Proposition in National Assembly, [210].
- VIVIAN, HON. J. C. WALTER, to be Under-Secretary of State to the Right Hon. E. Cardwell, 315.
- VOLTAIRE, Study on, by John Morley, [335].
- VOLUNTEERS, The Easter Monday Volunteer Review at Brighton, 45.
- VOYSEY, REV. C., case, [143]; Judgment of Judicial Committee of Privy Council on his case, 14; Letter to Registrar of Privy Council, 16; Trial, 166.
- WAHABEES, The, [131].
- WALES, PRINCE OF, The, at opening of Royal Albert Hall, 38; opens the first yearly International Exhibition, 53; visits Ireland, 80; installed patron of Freemasons in Ireland, *ib.*; at the military manœuvres in Hampshire, 92; at Sandringham, suffers from typhoid fever, 127; relapse, 134; excitement in London intense, 135; form of prayer issued, *ib.*; anxiety in all parts of Her Majesty's Dominions, 136; improvement on 14th December and gradual recovery, *ib.*; serious illness, [122]; letter of the Queen, [147].
- WALES, PRINCESS OF, Birth and death of an infant prince, 45.
- WAR, The French and German, its absorbing interest, [1]; sympathy for France [2]; firmness of the Ministry, [3]; the capitulation of Belfort, its final operation, [169]; peace signed, [171].
- WAR FUND, Immovable, of Prussia to be henceforth Imperial, [239].
- WARWICK CASTLE, Fire at, 131.
- WASHINGTON, Treaty of, [94]; signed and ratified by United States Senate, [98], discussed in Parliament, *ib.*; Debate in Senate, [287], Definitive Arrangements, 289.
- WATERSPOUT in the Channel, 98.
- WATSON, DR. JAMES, Obituary notice, 155.
- WATSON, Murder of Mrs., by her husband, 110.
- WEGUELIN, MR. ANDREW, Indians in South America.
- WELLS, MR., on the Cond in the United States, [28].
- WERDER, GENERAL, de Bourbaki at Belfort, [1].
- WEST INDIES, Hurricane.
- WESTMEATH, Proposal Committee of Inquiry, motion given by Lc [39]; debate, *ib.*; appointed, [48]; e [50].
- WESTMEATH, The Gran lutions in favour of in [48]; Westmeath Assiz.
- WESTMEATH, MARQUIS notice, 152.
- WHEAT HARVEST, [142].
- WHITE, COLONEL, seconds C Lindsay's resolution on sec of Army Regulation Bill, [5].
- WHITE'S CLUB HOUSE sold i 25.
- WHITEFIELD, GEORGE, Life of.
- WHITEHAVEN, Murphy the A Lecturer assaulted at, 49.
- WHYMPER'S, MR., "Scrambles the Alps," [348].
- WICKENS, JOHN, to be Vice-Cha 314, knighted, 315.
- WIGAN, MR. ALFRED, Dinner at L burch, on approaching retirement fr the stage, 125.
- WIGAN, Colliery explosion near, 97, 102.
- WILLIAM, EMPEROR OF GERMANY, in spect the troops at Longchamps pious to their entry into Paris, [174]; le Versailles for Ferrières, [175]; issues proclamation to the Prussian Diet accepting the Imperial Crown, [220]; arrives in Berlin, [221]; birthday congratulations, *ib.*; speech at opening of Reichstag on 21st March, [224]; at military triumph at Berlin, [229]; interview with Emperor of Austria at Gastein and Salzburg, [231]; speech at re-assembling of Reichstag on 16th October, [234], address of the bishops and reply thereto [236]; speech at opening of Prussian House of Deputies, [241], joins a hunting party in December, [243].
- WILLIAMS, LIEUT.-GENERAL, Obituary notice, 152.
- WIMBLEDON COMMON, Sham fight at, 19, annual meeting of National Rifle Association, 73; Volunteer Review, 75.
- WINTER BATHING in the Serpentine, 138.
- WINTERBOTHAM, MR., speech against Licensing Bill at Agricultural Hall, [61]; Under Secretary for Home Department, [68].

INDEX.

<p>n with six, 20.</p> <p>RAGE, Mr. J. S. Mill on, Mrs. Fawcett, 23.</p> <p>ANCELLOR, opens Read- ar School, 99.</p> <p>ONGRESS in Rome,</p> <p>Obituary notice,</p> <p>ikes in, 29.</p>	<p>YOUNG, CHARLES MAYNE, L.R.S.</p> <p>ZORILLA, RUIZ, Cortes Con- assassinat- of the Cabine Serrano, [268]</p>
--	--

